Methodism AND Anglicanism

T. G. WILLIAMS

To
Rev. W. P. Boshart
with compliments
Oct. 22nd T. G. Williams.
1893.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/methodismanglica00willuoft

METHODISM AND ANGLICANISM.

R.T. Wheel

Methodism and Anglicanism

IN THE LIGHT OF

SCRIPTURE AND HISTORY.

By T. G. WILLIAMS,
Methodist Minister.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION

By REV W. I. SHAW, LL.D.,

Professor of Classics, &c., Wesleyan Theological College, Montreal.

21472
21. 4. 27

TORONTO:

WILLIAM BRIGGS, 78 & 80 KING STREET EAST.

C. W. Coates, Montreal, Que. S. F. Huestis, Halifax, N.S.

1888

Entered according to Act of the Parliament of Canada, in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight, by WILLIAM BRIGGS, Book-Steward of the Methodist Book and Publishing House, Toronto, at the Department of Agriculture.

TO THE READERS.

The writer desires to ask the indulgence of his readers for the imperfections which appear in this book.

Being engaged in the duties of the pastorate, and many other matters imperatively demanding attention, his time was so fully occupied that it was only under pressure from esteemed friends that he consented to reconstruct a series of letters which were written in isolated hours snatched from a busy life, and put them in the present form. The proof-reading, and other parts of the work, have been done under great disadvantages, oftentimes when absent from home. This explanation, he trusts, will be accepted as an apology for errors which he has discovered when too late to correct them.

T. G. W.

ERRATA.

On page 64, in the sixth line, read *from whom* instead of *who*. On page 91, for *Cardinal Pole, Archbishop of York*, read *Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London.* On page 106, in the eighth line from the top, read *reasons* instead of *means.* On page 203, for *Princeton Review for 1885*, read *Princeton Review for 1855.*

PREFACE.

TO all who love Christ's kingdom intelligently, it is a cause of regret that the necessity for controversy should ever arise. The Great Teacher, our common Master, said, "All ye are brethren," and it was no part of His great purpose that His servants should waste their energy in internecine strife. His teaching demands, and His life exhibits that charity without which all profession is but "sounding brass and tinkling cymbal." This important lesson of Christian charity is fully set forth in God's Word, and yet its practical acceptance by the Christian Church is one of its latest triumphs.

In the strife occasioned by the efforts for sectarian advancement the claims of others have been ignored, and often boldly and offensively denied. The evidence of Divine approval, as exhibited in most marvellous success in winning men from sin and bringing them into vital union with Christ, has gone for nothing; the facts that moral wildernesses have been transformed into gardens of the Lord, that the tares of sin have been uprooted, and the Rose of Sharon made to bloom where all was once thorns and briars; that hearts have been purified, homes made Christian and souls fitted for Paradise, all go for nothing; and offensive epithets

have been rudely flung at honest toilers successfully doing their Master's work, and who, moreover, hold out to the world as their motto: "The friends of all and the enemies of none." It is not the duty of a true follower of the Lord of Peace to be quick to take offense and sharp to rebuke every insult; nor yet is it his duty to remain passive when agencies appointed and blessed of God are rudely and unfairly assailed. Loyalty to truth demands that mischievous errors, and assumptions as groundless as they are haughty, should be fearlessly met and exposed.

Ever since the "Holy Club," composed of John and Charles Wesley, with Mr. Morton and Mr. Kirkham, was organized that they might attain a closer walk with God, contumely and reproach have been showered upon Wesley and his followers.

Foremost among the assailants of Methodism we ever find that faction in the Episcopalian Church known as the Anglican, or High Church party. In spirit and teaching they are the legitimate descendants of Laud and Bonner, of unsavory memory. They have had a distinct and clearly defined form since the Tractarian Movement, as it is called, which dates from 1833, when Pusey, Manning, Keble, Newman, and some men of lesser note, startled and alarmed Anglo-Saxon Protestantism by their bold attempts to introduce teaching known distinctively as Romish into the Episcopalian Church.

Among the most puissant of their opponents stands the Methodist Church, and as the result of this potent and successful opposition, the vials of High Church

wrath have been poured out on this branch of Christ's Church. These attacks have been intermittent. When encouraged by the cessation of effort on the part of the defenders of Methodism to repel these assaults, they have grown defiant and insolent, and there have been ebullitions of wrath, and lofty pretensions to superiority. High Church Rab-shakehs have stood before the walls of Methodism and demanded unconditional surrender. They claim that they speak in the name of the Most High. Their messages are intended to terrify the hosts of Methodism, so that the condescending offers to enfold them in the tender embrace of Anglo-Catholicism will be eagerly accepted. Methodists are told they are not a part of the Church of Christ; that their ministers are only "priestly pretenders;" that John Wesley never left the Church of England; that John Wesley was a High Churchman and held all the doctrines they now hold, such as Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence, Apostolic Succession, Celibacy, etc.; that Wesley never intended that the Methodists should be independent of the Church of England, and many such characteristic statements. On the other hand, they sometimes assure us the Anglo-Catholic Church is the direct and lineal descendant of a Church founded in Britain by Paul or Pudens in the apostolic age; that the present Church of England did not have its origin in the Great Reformation which came into notice prominently in the reign of Henry VIII., but it was simply "the old Church washing her face." These, with many others of a similar character, have been

freely flung out to the world, but the Hezekiahs of Methodism have not been alarmed, they have kept on their way and continued to do the Master's work, while the High Church party have been caused to "hear a rumour," and have been compelled, many times, to return and defend their pretentious ecclesiastical structure with what energy they could command.

In consequence of recent and persistent attacks on the Methodist Church, the following pages have been written, in which the effort has been made to refute the statements which High Churchmen so persistently make against Methodism; and also point out some of the many fatal defects in the economy of the Anglican Body which effectually destroy their high pretensions that they, with their Romish and Greek sisters, constitute the only true Church of Christ, and also seriously weaken, if they do not totally invalidate, their claim to any place in the Household of Faith.

The charges they prefer against Methodism will be discussed in the light of history—secular and ecclesiastical—and proofs furnished by references so as to establish the accuracy of the statements beyond all reasonable doubt.

T. G. W.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Introduction ix

CHAPTER I.

Did John Wesley Separate from the Church of England?—Lord Mansfield's Opinion—The testimony of the Bishop of Liverpool 11

CHAPTER II.

Was the Establishment of the Methodist societies into an independent Church in harmony with Wesley's final plans?.. 25

CHAPTER III.

Was John Wesley a High Churchman?—What is High Churchism?—In what sense John Wesley was a High Churchman —Wesley's teaching concerning Baptismal Regeneration.. 36

CHAPTER IV.

What was the origin of the Church of England? 54

CHAPTER V.

Did the Papal Church, founded in Britain in 596-7, remain a Papal Church till the time of Henry VIII.? 73

CHAPTER VI.

Has the Church of England a valid autonomy, and Apostolic line from the Church of Rome? 84

CHAPTER VII.

Do other Churches admit that the Church of England has an Apostolic Succession, such as the High Church Party assert they possess?—Are High Churchmen themselves satisfied that their ordinations are valid? 103

CHAPTER VIII.

Did the present Church of England arise in the Sixteenth Century?—Is it Protestant? 112

CHAPTER IX.

Is High Churchism Romanism?—Extracts from High Church Manuals. 129

CHAPTER X.

Is the Episcopal form of Church Government prescribed in Scripture?—Is it the only valid form for a Christian Church 158

CHAPTER XI.

The Wider Question—Is the High Church doctrine of Apostolic Succession a Scriptural truth?—Was it instituted on the mount in Galilee? 183

CHAPTER XII.

The testimony of history, and of some of the earlier and later divines in the Church of England regarding the doctrine of Apostolic Succession 190

CHAPTER XIII.

What are the tests and proofs of a true Gospel Ministry?—First, conformity in essentials to the teachings and practices of the Apostles; and second, our Saviour's test, "By their fruits ye shall know them"—How the Episcopalian branch compares with the Methodist, when thus tested 209

CHAPTER XIV.

The second test of a true Church of Christ, "By their fruits ye shall know them"—A comparison of the claims of the Episcopal with the Methodist Church 228

CHAPTER XV.

Is the Methodist Church a valid Scriptural Church?—A true Church defined—The harmony between the procedure in the Methodist Church and the Holy Scriptures 238

CHAPTER XVI.

Is Methodist polity in harmony with the Scriptural plan?—An examination of its method of ordaining.. 252

INTRODUCTION.

METHODISM is a revolution, and yet it is not revolutionary. It has let loose by its quiet, steady growth, potent influences which, in the main, have blessed the world, and are conspicuous among the great forces which are moulding the age, and yet it has been free from every element of anarchy. It has been more constructive than destructive. It did not originate in feuds, but in a revived spiritual life. It is the only great Church in Christendom free from the blood of persecution. It did not, with hatred, leave and oppose the Church of England. It was gradually and most unjustly thrust out of that great communion. Our relation to the Anglican Church being much misunderstood and misrepresented, has, therefore, ever been a fruitful source of controversy. On the one side, many a wise and catholic writer, from Wesley down to Rigg, has calmly and correctly stated that relation; and on the other, many a so-called "Churchman," with much petulance, has reproached us with what he calls the terrible sin of schism, and peremptorily demanded our return to the fold of "the Church;" while all the world knows that, as things are now, there is no more possibility of this reunion than there is of the sixty millions of American citizens becoming as colonists subject to the government of the thirty millions of people in the British Islands.

Among Methodists there are two extremes of feeling with reference to these relations. On the one side of the subject, and on one side of the Atlantic, there are a few—their number fortunately is diminishing—who, in their obsequiousness, get down in the dust before Anglican assumptions, to the disgust of their brethren and of other Churches. Truth compels me to say that, on the other side, there are a few, perhaps, especially in America—and their number is fortunately diminishing—who relegate Anglicans and Romanists alike to the death and darkness of reprobacy; who, in fact, share the bigotry and ignorance of their adversaries, and think that, outside of the Methodist Church, no body has got "religion." The golden mean here is that of manly, courteous, Christian dignity, with calm resistance of all assumptions, and at the same time a generous appreciation of the magnificent monuments of Christian scholarship and Christian enterprise characterizing the grand old Church in which Methodism had the honor to be born. This golden mean, I think, marks the attitude of my brother who has written the following pages. He is thoroughly familiar with his subject in all its phases. He loves not controversy for controversy's sake, but he knows well, as long as Ephraim persists in vexing Judah, how to defend against all ecclesiastical intolerance the great work of God which we call Methodism, which has brought millions to a knowledge of Christ, and elevated them to a pure, intelligent, and noble life.

William I. Shaw.

CHAPTER I.

Did John Wesley separate from the Church of England? —Lord Mansfield's Opinion—The Testimony of the Bishop of Liverpool.

TIME works wondrous changes in the opinions of men. A few decades ago it was the custom in High Church circles to denounce John Wesley as a schismatic and a dissenter from the Church of England.

These denunciations were loud, long and violent. But a strange change has come over that party in a few years past. By what magic spell it has been accomplished I will not say, but their policy has undergone a complete revision, and now, they only are schismatics, in the estimation of this same faction, who refuse to follow, what they, with their new light, call Wesley's example. They are now as persistent in their affirmations, and as earnest in their efforts to prove that John Wesley was ever a true and loyal son of the Church, and that he ever desired that Methodism should be merely a society within, and subject to, the Church of England, as they formerly were in their attempts to brand him as guilty of the terrible sin of schism. We very naturally ask, which of their

contradictory assertions is in accord with fact; when they for many years declared, not brooking any opposition, that Wesley was a schismatic, or when they say, as they do now, that he was no schismatic, and never separated from the Episcopal Church? It is evident that both contradictories cannot be true, so we are forced to look at the facts which history reveals, and base our opinion on them, rather than on the uncertain and mutually destructive declarations of High Churchmen.

We find frequent instances in the writings of John Wesley where he affirms his loyalty to the Church of his birth, and his oft-expressed determination not to leave it. Yet the fact is undeniable that he did at different times in his life deliberately violate the fundamental laws of the Church, and that he pursued a course for long years which was in direct violation of the canons of the Church. It is also true that, while he declared he would not leave the Church, he at the same time so set its vital principles at defiance that the bishops of the Church denounced him as a schismatic, and forbade the clergy to allow him to officiate in their churches. In brief, his attitude, as shown by all his biographers, was implicit obedience to the dictates of conscience, Providential leadings, and an enlightened reason; and when obedience to Church law opposed his sense of duty, the Church law was quietly, but firmly, ignored. His determination evidently was to remain in the Church of England till forced by the authorities of that Church to leave it. Were the question in dispute,

"Did Wesley declare that he would never leave the Church of England?" there would be no more room for divergence of opinion than there is when the query is, "Did Wesley ever separate from the Church of England?" In both instances the reply would be in the affirmative. Mr. Tyerman, in his excellent biography, claims that there is a glaring inconsistency between Wesley's declaration on this point, and his conduct, but it is possible that if the lips of the dead were unclosed, and his true meaning placed before us, the divergence would shrink marvellously. This question was considered by Wesley and the Conferences in two aspects, which differed widely in their moral significance. One was, Is it right in a moral or religious sense for us to separate from the Church of England? the other, Is it expedient for us to do so? The question as to whether it was expedient, as a matter of course, could not be debated with any consistency, till it was settled that there was no moral wrong, nor any violation of true religious principle in so doing, for all will admit that no court of religious men could agree that it was expedient to do a thing which was morally wrong, or of the morality of which they were in doubt. They did not belong to the class of religious teachers who proclaim that they may "do evil that good may come." There must have been at least the admission that it was not morally wrong, or they could not have consistently debated whether it would be expedient for them to separate from the Church of England. Both aspects of the question engaged the attention, not

only of Wesley and the Conferences, but of many clergymen in the Church of England, and widely divergent views were held. The Church party contended that it was a plain violation of God's law, and any who did so were guilty of the dreadful sin of schism; and there were those who not only denied that it was in any sense contrary to the Divine Word, but held that, in view of the painfully apparent want of spiritual life in nearly all of the clergymen of the Episcopal body, and the shameless profligacy and immorality of vast numbers of those who read her services and administered the sacraments in her churches, it was not simply a right thing to separate from such an unholy communion, but it was also a solemn and imperative duty to do so Wesley at first held the former view, and contended it would be a sin against God for them to leave the Church, but after full discussions he very greatly modified this view, and instead of debating the question solely as a matter of right or wrong, he is found arguing with his Conferences on it as a question of expediency, tacitly admitting that there was no moral wrong in the proposed course, and also acknowledging he could not "answer the reasons urged in favor of separation." Surely he would not have found any difficulty in answering reasons urged in favor of what he believed to be contrary to God's law and will!

As early as 1755 Wesley wrote the following, after listening to the arguments urged for separation from the Church:

"I will freely acknowledge that I cannot answer

these arguments to my own satisfaction; so that my conclusion, which I cannot yet give up, that it is *lawful to continue in* the Church, stands almost without any premises that are able to bear its weight." (Tyerman's *Life of Wesley*, vol. ii., p. 208.)

And further on, he says regarding the course he had pursued, in "preaching abroad," "praying extempore," "forming societies," and "permitting preachers who were not episcopally ordained," "Were we pushed on this side, were there no alternative allowed, we should judge it our bounden duty *rather wholly to separate from the Church*, than to give up any one of these points. Therefore, if we cannot stop a separation without stopping lay preachers, the case is clear: we cannot stop it at all." Yet it will be noticed that these points, of which he says, he will "*rather wholly separate from the Church than give up any one of them*," were violations of the laws of the Church of England. There is great significance in the words of Wesley, in the first of the above quotations. The question before them was not simply, "Will it be an unlawful act for us to separate from the Church?" but a sharper one than that, for Wesley says, "My conclusion that it is lawful *to continue* in the Church, stands almost without any premises that are able to bear its own weight." In other words, "*Can we continue in even the partial relation* which we now bear to the Church without doing a morally unlawful thing?" His prejudices would not yet allow him to give up his attachment to the National Church, and still he could not answer

satisfactorily, even to himself, the reasons submitted to him in favor of a separation. It was simply a conflict between early prejudices on one side, and the decision of his judgment, reason, and conscience on the other. Did he ever fully settle the contention? We think not. There is abundant evidence that even to the latest years of his life there remained the antagonism between a loved theory and a stern sense of duty. Still his was no vacillating and inconstant course, for while he permitted his prejudices to mould and control his theory to a considerable extent, judgment, reason, and conscience swayed an imperial sceptre over the domain of Wesley's actions. From these opposing forces discord must arise, and we find it in the want of harmony between the words of Wesley, in which he often declares his adherence to the Church of England, and his acts of open rebellion against laws which that Church held as fundamental. That this antagonism existed and manifested itself in what must be admitted as inconsistencies between Wesley's words and acts, no one can deny, but it materially weakens, if it does not totally destroy the moral force of the charge, when we remember that Wesley openly and honestly admitted he could not defend his theory, which was the offspring of his prejudices; while, on the other hand, he as boldly declared his perfect confidence in the righteousness of his acts, which were at once contradictions to his theory and rebellion against the Church of England. He further declared, in reference to these acts of

rebellion against the authority of the Church of England, that "it would be our bounden duty rather wholly to separate from the Church, than to give up any one of these points."

In other words, Wesley stated that in this conflict between his theory, the offspring of his prejudices, which he could not defend; and his deliberate acts, which were the results of his judgment, reason, and conscience, and which he could defend, if it came to a final issue, he would abandon the defenceless theory to destruction, and continue the course of conduct which was opposed to his theory, that is, he would be controlled by judgment, reason, and conscience in the discharge of his duty to God and man, rather than by prejudices. Now we shall undertake to show that this was the course Wesley actually pursued, that in fact he did separate from the Church of England, and it follows that it was only because the Episcopal Church did not force these antagonistic elements to a final issue, that John Wesley was not driven to an open, formal, and declared separation from the National Church. I shall now submit proof that as the term "separation from a Church" is now understood in ordinary language, Wesley did undoubtedly, by his acts, separate from the Church of England.

Charles Wesley endeavored to dissuade John from ordaining ministers. In a letter written him dated July 27th, 1786, Charles says, "I believe Lord Mansfield's decisive words to me—'Ordination is separation.'" We have here the opinion of Charles Wesley, and Lord Mansfield—one of England's most celebrated jurists—

clearly and positively stated, that by this violation of the principle upon which the orders of the Church of England rests, viz., that of episcopacy, which permits only such as hold what they term bishop's orders, to ordain others, Wesley actually separated himself from the Church of England. Tyerman himself puts it with equal explicitness in the third volume of his *Life of Wesley*, pp. 448 and 449, where he says: "There can be no doubt that, as a minister of the Church of Christ, Wesley had as much right to ordain as any bishop, priest, or presbyter in existence; but he had no right to this as a clergyman of the Church of England, and by acting as he did he became what he was unwilling to acknowledge, a Dissenter, a separatist from that Church. Such was the opinion of Lord Mansfield, and such was the argument of Wesley's brother."

The *Life of Wesley*, by that polished scholar, but bitter foe of Wesley, Southey, bears clear testimony to the correctness of the position that Wesley separated from the Church of England. He says: "Wesley had long deceived himself respecting the part which he was acting toward the Church of England. At the outset of his career he had no intention of setting himself up in opposition to it; and when, in his progress toward schism, he disregarded its forms, and set its discipline at naught, he still repeatedly disclaimed all views of separation. Nor did he ever avow the wish, or refer to it as a likely event, with complacency, even when he must have perceived that the course of his conduct and the temper of his fol-

lowers rendered it inevitable. On this occasion (the ordination of Dr. Coke) his actions spoke for him; by arrogating to himself the episcopal authority he took the only step which was wanting to form the Methodists into a distinct body of separatists from the Church. (Southey's *Life of Wesley*, vol. ii., p. 250.)

We cannot imagine the Methodists as a "distinct body of separatists from the Church," with John Wesley at their head, and he, their head, a member of the Church of England, and not a "separatist."

Again, the testimony of another Church of England writer—Miss Wedgewood—is clear and positive on this point. Miss Wedgewood says: "It was not in their (the Church of England) power to CRUSH the new order, but the strange anomalies of English law had left it in THEIR POWER TO FORCE it to become a sect. If it was possible that the Church of England should sanction an itinerant order preaching her doctrines, and, with the few additions NECESSARY TO SECURE THEIR OWN EXISTENCE, enforcing her rules, the clergy of the eighteenth century determined to make it impossible. They EXCOMMUNICATED the Methodists; they set on the mob to stone them; they diverted all the energy which had been spent on Deists and Arians to attack the men who preached the Gospel to heathens. THUS FORCED INTO A CAMP OF THEIR OWN, ORGANIZATION AND DISCIPLINE BECAME A NECESSITY TO THE ORDER. They would gladly still have attended the parish churches; they did for very long continue to repair to them for the sacred rites which formed their pledges of church-membership; BUT EVEN THIS HAD

TO BE GIVEN UP AT LAST, and at the close of Wesley's long life the time arrived for this LAST STAGE in Methodist organization and separation from the Church." (See Wedgewood's *John Wesley, and the Evangelical Reaction of the 18th Century*," pp. 378 and 379.)

The Bishop of Liverpool, Dr. Ryle, in a lecture he delivered recently, said, "There are many things the people ought to know about Wesley that are not generally known, and among them this: That he loved the Church of England from the earliest days of his life; that he never formally left the Church of England, but that the Church of England obliged him to go outside." (*Methodism a Part of the Great Christian Apostacy.* By W. Christie, B.A. Camb., p. 4.)

Surely our High Church friends will not claim that, when their predecessors "obliged" Wesley "to go outside," he was at the same time "inside the Church of England." It is clear from these testimonies that, though Wesley may have desired to remain in the Church of England, and did frequently declare he would not leave it, yet, as a matter of fact, he was actually "outside" the Church, by the action of the ecclesiastical ancestors of the very men who now so eagerly declare Wesley never left the Church. It is certain he could not be both "inside" and "outside" the Church at the same time. After this statement from the Bishop of Liverpool, one sees clearly that one reason why Anglicans now contend Wesley never left the Church is because, to use the bishop's own words, "There are many things the people

ought to know about Wesley that are not generally known, and among them this . . . that the Church of England obliged him to go outside." In other words, they say Wesley never left the Church, because there are some things they ought to know that they do not know.

The position of Wesley in regard to this matter is also shown by several other important acts.

Every reader of Methodist history knows that, when the question of holding meetings in the Methodist chapels during church hours was first discussed in the Conferences, Wesley refused to allow it, declaring that such an act would be equal to separation from the Church; yet before Wesley's death we find that he sanctioned this act, which he before said was equal to separation from the Church. (See Minutes of the Conference held at Bristol, July 25th, 1786, where the following question was asked: 2. In what cases do we allow of service in Church hours? A. 1. When the minister is a notoriously wicked man. 2. When he preaches Arian, or any equally pernicious doctrine, etc., etc.) (See Myles' *Chronological History of Methodism*, p. 171.)

The following historical facts are convincing as to his independent attitude to the Church:

"Mr. Wesley had hitherto ordained ministers only for America and Scotland, but from this period, being assisted by the Rev. James Creighton, and the Rev. Peard Dickenson, presbyters of the Church of England, he set apart for the sacred office, by the imposition of hands, and prayer, Messrs. Alexander Mather, Thomas

Rankin and Henry Moore *without sending them out of England.*" (See Myles' *Chronological History of the People called Methodists*, p. 175.)

"Mr. Wesley had hitherto ordained ministers only for America and Scotland. But during the period I have mentioned, being assisted by other presbyters of the Church of England, he set apart a certain number of preachers for the sacred office, by the imposition of his hands, and prayer, *without sending them out of England.*" (See Moore's *Life of Wesley*, vol. ii., p. 175.)

See also *Encyclopædia Brit. Art. Meth.*, p. 187: "At length, in 1788, Wesley ordained a number of preachers *to assist him in administering the sacraments to the societies in England.*"

See report of the case of Mastin *vs.* Escott, tried in England before Sir Herbert Jenner, p. 181.

Dr. Haggard. . . . and it would have been proved indisputably that Mr. Wesley toward the close of his life relaxed from that principle which influenced him in early life, and that he did not hesitate himself to impart the sacraments, and by his authority, advice and sanction, he also communicated that power to some of his followers. . . . *These ministers administered both the sacrament of baptism and the sacrament of the Holy Communion.*"

But Anglicans tell us that in the year 1789 Wesley preached the sermon "On the Ministerial Office," and in it abandoned the theory that presbyters and bishops were but one order. On the contrary, proof exists which shows that after June 26th, 1790, Wesley actually exercised the power which Anglicans declare he, in 1789, denied he possessed.

For proof, see *Life of Wesley* by Coke and Moore. On pp. 430 and 431 is to be found a letter written by Wesley to a bishop in the Church of England, and dated "June 26th, 1790," and immediately after the letter follow these sentences:

"Mr. Wesley had hitherto ordained ministers only for America and Scotland. But during the period we have mentioned, being assisted by other presbyters of the Church of England, he set apart a certain number of preachers for the sacred office, by the imposition of his hands, and prayer, without sending them out of England; ONE OF THESE HE ORDAINED AFTER WRITING THE ABOVE LETTER." That is, Wesley ordained a minister in 1790, the year *after* the Anglicans say that he renounced his belief that presbyters and bishops were the same order.

The following conditions are necessary to effect a legal, formal and public separation of one from a community of which he is a member: 1st. A violation of some law, the penalty for which is expulsion. 2nd. A judgment by the proper authorities, that the conduct of one accused is such a violation. 3rd. The imposition of the penalty upon the transgressor. 4th. The publication of the judgment and of the enforcement of the sentence. But for a *virtual* separation all these conditions are not necessary, and can be effected with only a portion of them. A violation of a law, the penalty of which is exclusion, the judgment by the proper authorities, and the declaration of the sentence, constitute virtual separation. All these met in the case of John Wesley and the English Church. 1st.

He violated the laws in several ways already specified. 2nd. He was judged by the bishops. 3rd. He was punished by exclusion from participation in Church services in any of their parishes, though not formally expelled. These three certainly constitute a virtual separation, and all meet in the case, English Church *vs.* John Wesley. He, however, refused to recognize the significance of the act, because the open and formal expulsion was not made, yet it remains an undeniable fact that, in the common-sense and ordinary use of words, John Wesley did separate from the Church of England. This open rebellion against Church authority, his bold defiance of its fundamental canons, and his action in securing the legal and ecclesiastical autonomy of the Methodists as a Christian Church, which we will show in the next chapter, prove, beyond all possibility of reasonable doubt, that John Wesley did separate himself from the Episcopalian Church in England.

CHAPTER II.

Was the Establishment of the Methodist Societies into an Independent Church in Harmony with Wesley's Final Plans?

AN answer in the affirmative to the above question would result from the conclusions reached in the preceding chapter; but as there is a slight difference in the questions, and the proofs are so interlaced that each position strengthens the other, it will be well to submit, in addition to these already presented, proofs bearing immediately on this point. As such frequent references are made by High Churchmen to Wesley's opposition to separation from the Church of England, and, as it is a fact that actual separation had taken place before Wesley's death, it will be well to obtain Wesley's own explanation of what he meant when he so frequently pressed his followers "not to separate from the Church of England."

It may be that by so doing his position will be more clearly apprehended.

We will allow Wesley to speak for himself on this matter of separation from the Church, and have his explanation of his oft-repeated injunction, "not to leave the Church," which High Churchmen quote so frequently.

Let us see what Wesley meant by "leaving the Church," and whether he did not approve of the separation of the Methodists in the very way in which it was accomplished.

In proof I will give one of Wesley's own letters on this point. The letter was written on the 20th day of September, 1788, at Bristol, and is found in *Wesley's Works*, vol. vii. p. 319: "Thoughts on Separation from the Church."

"My Dear Friend,—The question properly refers (when we speak of separation from the Church) to a total and immediate separation. Such was that of Mr. Ingham's people first, and afterwards that of Lady Huntingdon's, who all agreed to form themselves into a separate body without delay, to go to the Church *no more; to have no more connection with the Church of England than with the Church of Rome. Such* a separation I have always declared against, and certainly it will not take place (if it ever does) while I live. *But a kind of separation has already taken place, and will inevitably spread, though by slow degrees.* Those ministers, so called, who neither live nor preach the gospel, I dare not say are sent of God. Where one of them is settled many of the Methodists dare not attend his ministry; so if there be no other church in the neighborhood *they go to church no more.* This is the case in a few places already, and *it will be the case in more;* and no one can justly blame me for this, neither is it contrary to any of my professions.

"John Wesley.

"*Bristol*, Sept. 20th, 1788."

This letter explains Wesley's position on the question of separation from the Church of England. It shows that he was opposed to a "total and immediate separation, in which the people as a body would all agree to form themselves into a separate body without delay, and to have no more connection with the Church of England than with the Church of Rome;" that is to say, Wesley opposed a hasty, violent and angry separation from the Church of England, in which there would be as violent antagonism to that Church as there was to the Church of Rome. It also shows, to use Wesley's own words, "that a kind of separation had already taken place, and would inevitably spread," and that this "separation was not contrary to any of his professions," but, on the contrary, he provided for the wants of the Methodists after this separation, by having his preachers licensed under law to preach, by ordaining them to administer the sacraments, and by securing a legal standing for the Conference by an Act of Parliament. Of this kind of separation Wesley said, it "was not contrary to any of my professions." It was a quiet, peaceable, gradual separation, not effected by hasty, violent acts on the part of the Methodists, but forced upon them by the violence and brutality of the Church of England, as their own historian, Miss Wedgewood, admits. This kind of separation, which had already taken place, did spread till it completed the separation of the Methodist Church from the Church of England, and it was the kind of separation which Wesley said "*was not contrary to any of my professions.*"

It shows that Wesley saw, and consented to a kind of separation from the Church, which he knew would "inevitably spread," and which he foresaw would end in the total separation of the Methodists from the Church of England; and by ordaining ministers for his societies he built them up, and prepared them *ecclesiastically*, for the position which he secured to them *legally* by the Deed of Settlement, of which he said it is "a foundation likely to stand as long as the sun and moon endure."

In the light of these surroundings it is clear Wesley foresaw the end of the separation which he says had already begun, and he wisely provided for the Church which, under the providence of God, he founded, and which, by God's blessing, has done much to aid in the work of spreading the Gospel.

We now see that it is only from a superficial view of the real facts, and by ignoring Wesley's explanation of what he meant by separating from the Church, as well as by denying the judgment of those most fully qualified to judge, that one can say that "Wesley never left the Church of England," and that he did not intend the Methodist societies should be separate from that Church. In other words, an affirmative answer must be given to the question—"Is it ignorance of the history of Methodism that makes the Anglicans claim that Wesley never left the Church?"—for it is perfectly clear Mr. Wesley did leave the Episcopal Church, and organized, and carried out successfully, a plan which effectually separated the Methodists from the Church of England, and of which Wesley said, "Neither is it contrary to my professions."

But further proof is found that Mr. Wesley designed to secure the permanent establishment of the societies he organized in the legal standing which he provided for them.

He obtained a Deed of Settlement securing a legal standing for the Methodist Conference, and said of it, that "it is a foundation likely to stand as long as the sun and moon endure." (See Coke and Moore's *Life of Wesley*, p. 306.)

But Anglicans contend that Wesley did not intend that the Methodists should form a separate and independent church, and claim that though the Deed of Settlement gave them a legal standing, yet it could not be that Wesley designed that they should be an independent church, because "the deed did not provide for the administration of the sacraments." They forget that Wesley held the power to ordain ministers, and actually did ordain them, and thus provided for the sacraments, hence it was not necessary to incorporate this *ecclesiastical* authority already in possession, in a document which was purely a *legal security* for the Methodist Church against the bitter and brutal spirit of persecution which governed this boasted apostolic Church of England.

Then again, though the English Church in the case of Archbishop Parker's ordination, and that of several other bishops, obtained their power to consecrate, from an ordinal devised by a secular court, viz., the Parliament, yet Wesley and the Methodists did not believe such a court could confer such powers, and hence it was not necessary to include them in the Deed

of Settlement. But now for the proof that Wesley meant that the Methodists should form a separate and independent church.

The following historical facts prove that Wesley, however reluctantly, *did provide for the separate and independent existence of the Methodist Church:*

1st. He and his ministers held services in the Methodist churches during "church hours," for many years, which at first he refused to do, holding that it would be equal to a separation from the Church. (See Myles' *Chron. His. of Meth.*, p. 172.)

2nd. He obtained a Deed of Settlement securing a legal standing for the Methodist Conference, and said of it, that "it was a foundation likely to stand as long as the sun and moon endure." (See Coke and Moore's *Life of Wesley*, p. 306.)

3rd. He had his preachers licensed as preachers under the Act for the protection of Dissenting Ministers. (See Myles' *Chron. His.*, book vii., p. 174; *Wesley's Works*, vol. iv., p. 683; and Moore's *Life of Wesley*, book viii., chap. 4.)

4th. He ordained minisisters for the work of administering the sacraments to the Methodists in America, in Scotland, in Ireland and in England. (See Moore's *Life of Wesley*, vol. ii., p. 227; Myles' *Chron. His. of the People called Methodists*, p. 175; *Encyclopædia Brit. Art. Meth.*, p. 187.)

5th. Wesley secured *all the property and financial interests* of the Methodists to them as a body perfectly independent of the Church of England.

6th. The members of the Methodist societies, as

such, were in no way responsible to the Church of England for obedience to the laws of the Church, and actually yielded no such obedience to the Church of England.

In summing up we learn that the relation of Methodism to the Church of England before Wesley's death, which relation Wesley, after much thought and effort, himself secured for it was as follows: The Methodists had separate places of worship, in which they conducted services at the same time as the Church of England. They had their own ministers licensed under the Act for Dissenting Ministers. They had their own sacraments provided for, by ministers ordained by Wesley himself. They had their own financial system, and their property entirely independent of, and outside, the Church of England; and though all these privileges were legally secured to the Methodists by Mr. Wesley, yet in this age some men have the effrontery to say Mr. Wesley never intended the Methodist Church to be independent of the Church of England! which, I submit the plain historical facts I have produced, abundantly and positively contradict; and, on the other hand, they fully establish the claim that the establishment of the Methodist Societies into an independent church was the actual aim of Mr. Wesley's final plans, and that it was successfully accomplished by him.

Without having the explanation which it is possible Wesley might give, were he now living, it is impossible for us fully to exonerate him from the charge of inconsistency, which some of his biographers, especially Tyerman and Southey, prefer against him; yet we do

not admit for one moment that there is a particle of truth in the more serious charge of hypocrisy and deceit with which the latter, with so much bitterness, charges him. From the training of his childhood, youth, and manhood, Wesley held views, which are now admitted to be extreme and untenable, regarding the claims of the Established Church upon all professing the Christian faith who were born in England. He held that all who were not dissenters either by birth, or by choice, were members of the National Church of England, and that this birthright privilege could not be forfeited save by a formal expulsion, or by a voluntary and declared union with some dissenting Church. In his case neither of these conditions was present, for while he openly violated principles held as sacred and fundamental by the National Church in his day, and was inhibited from the exercise of his ministry in their pulpits and parishes, in condemnation of his irregular and disobedient conduct; yet, owing to the wonderful, and in many instances, shamefully lax administration of Church discipline which prevailed, no formal sentence of expulsion was ever pronounced against him. Thus, while he actually left the Church of England by trampling under his feet the principle of obedience to the bishops, and even by assuming, and actually exercising, the distinguishing prerogatives of the episcopal order, yet, as he was never formally expelled, he declared he was still a member of the Episcopalian Church. And again, while he organized, consolidated, and secured a legal position for Methodism, of which he was the founder,

still, as it was not formally declared by competent Church courts to be ecclesiastically a dissenting church, but viewed by them as an irregularity which would probably disappear with the death of its founder, though he was the head, the law-maker, and, as Southey would have him, the imperious autocrat of this new body of Christians, yet he never assumed that it was what it had never been authoritatively declared to be, a dissenting church, hence he never professed to be a member of a dissenting church. Still the fact stands immovable amid all his declarations that he would never leave the Church of England, that nevertheless he, by his deliberate and determined acts, put himself in such an attitude to the Church that, had the laws upon which the very existence ecclesiastically of the Church of England was based been put in force, John Wesley would have been degraded from her ministry, and expelled from her communion. His legal status in the Church of England, because of his open, wilful, and persistent violations of her fundamental principles, can be properly compared to the legal status of a man who openly, wilfully, and persistently violates a law, the penalty for which is the loss of his life, and yet, because of a laxity in the enforcement of the law, he is not actually deprived of life, though the community of which he is a member declare his guilt, and deny him the privileges of citizenship. Such a person may truthfully declare, "I am a member of your community, for you have not executed the law, and I will never cease to be till death, unless you enforce your laws which I have violated, and thus com-

pel me to separate from you. Further, I will continue to violate these laws, for however sacred you may think them, I cannot keep a clear conscience and obey them, though on the whole I admire your code, and think it the best yet formulated, notwithstanding its serious defects. It is not our duty to explain why the laws against Wesley were not enforced. That falls to the lot of those who differ from us. John Wesley admired and loved the Church of England, yet his love of souls was a stronger passion; and when the claims of the Church on his obedience demanded that he should disobey her fundamental principles, or forego his labors to save the lost, the stronger love prevailed, and John Wesley, calmly, deliberately, and conscientiously, began, and continued for fifty three years, a systematic violation of such laws of the Church of England as would have, if enforced, expelled him from her communion. Of this he was aware, but he was determined that if he and his societies were "forced into a camp of their own," it should be by the action of the Church authorities, and not by any formal declaration from him or his societies. Till this formal action was taken he persisted in claiming his right to membership in the National Church to which, he held, his birth entitled him.

But when we turn to the actual, instead of the theoretical and formal, we are forced to the conclusion that Wesley, by his violations of Church law, did separate from the Church of England, and his biographers say, "This was the opinion of his brother Charles and of Lord Mansfield." What is here said of

the actual relation of Wesley to the National Church, may with equal force and accuracy be affirmed of the relation of the Methodism of England to the Church of England. While there was no formal and official declaration of the separation, that separation was an accomplished fact years before Wesley's death. That this separation was actual, and was recognized as such by the parliament of the realm, is placed beyond dispute by the enactment of a statute secured by Wesley, called the Deed of Settlement, whereby the independent autonomy of the Methodist Church was placed upon a basis which Wesley declared "likely to stand as long as the sun and moon endure." When the facts are thus even briefly presented, it is apparent that to say, John Wesley never left the Church of England, and never intended that the Methodists should be separated from, and independent of, the Episcopalian Church, is simply a play upon words, and does not express the true relation of John Wesley and Methodism to the Church of England. From Wesley's deliberate acts it is perfectly evident the separation of Methodism from the Church of England harmonized with his intentions in his later years, and he said it was not contrary to any of his professions.

CHAPTER III.

Was John Wesley a High Churchman? What is High Churchism? In what sense John Wesley was a High Churchman. Wesley's teaching concerning Baptismal Regeneration.

IT is a cause of surprise to Methodists who are not familiar with the facts, when they are told for the first time, calmly, and in a tone of perfect assurance by some High Churchman, that, "John Wesley was himself a High Churchman." Their astonishment will be increased when their informant blandly insinuates that they are not familiar with Wesley's writings, or they would know that when in Georgia, Wesley taught doctrines that were "very High Church," and that in 1775, when Wesley was seventy-two years of age, he wrote a letter to Lord North, in which he says, "I am a High Churchman, the son of a High Churchman." If not familiar with the sense in which Wesley used this term, they will be in a strange dilemma. They will at once think of the Romish doctrines taught by the High Church party, since its organization in its present form by the leaders of the Tractarian movement of 1833, and find themselves confused by any attempt to reconcile them with what they have ever recognized as Methodist doctrine.

They will call to mind that the High Church party teach that water baptism is the means by which one is regenerated, or born again; while they have always been taught that a man is regenerated when through godly sorrow for past sins, and a present personal faith in Jesus Christ as his Saviour, he rests upon the atonement made for his sins, that then, and not till then, does the Spirit of God create him anew in Christ Jesus; and that though the sacrament of baptism may have been administered to him, still he is not thereby regenerated, for Wesley said in his sermon on the New Birth, "Be you baptized or unbaptized, you must be born again."

They find they cannot reconcile the teachings of John Wesley with the Romish doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and they wonder why Wesley said, "I am a High Churchman."

Then they call to mind that the High Churchmen of to-day teach the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body of flesh and blood, in the bread and wine, the sacramental symbols, and their difficulty increases if they try to reconcile this with Wesley's life-long teaching.

Then follow in rapid succession the recollection of other dogmas taught by the High Church, such as private confession of sins to a priest, with absolution by the priest; the doctrine of Apostolic succession, which High Churchmen hold as essential, but which Wesley denied; and many other important and essential matters in which there is the most positive contradiction between the views Wesley taught, and the

teaching of High Churchmen. The darkness thickens till, from the force of the contradictions, light breaks in, and they discover that when Wesley said, "I am a High Churchmen," he meant something essentially and entirely different from the High Churchism of to-day. With this simple, and yet inevitable discovery, a new character attaches to the kind, patronizing High Church friend, who is so generously trying to enlighten them, and he now stands before them as one who does not know that the whole of John Wesley's life as the founder of Methodism, was an earnest and practical contradiction to High Churchism; or, in the still less enviable character of one who is endeavoring to proselyte by resorting to deception.

It will be well for us to present very briefly at this point some of the doctrines which are known as distinctively High Church, so that the glaring contradiction between them and the teaching of John Wesley, which is faithfully reproduced by the Methodist Church of to-day, may be seen. At a later period it will be proven that the doctrines here attributed to the High Church are actually held and taught by them.

How can one acquainted with John Wesley say he was a High Churchman, when it is known that High Church teaching means an acceptance of the doctrine of episcopacy, or three distinct and separate orders in the ministry, as essential to the existence of a true Church of Christ, while John Wesley held the belief that a presbyter and a bishop were one and the same order, and that there was not a third order in the ministry. High Churchism also means a belief in an

unbroken line of apostolic succession from the apostles to the present time, and John Wesley said of that claim, "It is a fable which no man ever did or can prove." It also means auricular or private confession of sins to a priest, with a belief that the priest is empowered of God to absolve the penitent. They claim that the social means of grace, called class-meeting, instituted by Wesley, is a proof of their assertion that Wesley held the views they teach on this point. (See *John Wesley in Company with High Churchmen.*)

A few moments will suffice to remove all such false notions. There is not one essential feature the same. Confession means an acknowledgment of particular sins. A class-meeting may consist entirely of acknowledgments of the kind dealings of God with the members of the class, the recording anew of vows of service, and the expression of encouraging words, without one word of confession of sin. It is not a confessional. Auricular confession, as taught by the Romanists and High Churchmen, means a private confession of sins in the ear of a priest; whereas in the class-meeting the leader is generally a layman or a woman.

High Church confession implies also the power in the priest to absolve the penitent from the penalties of the sins confessed, while no such profanation of God's prerogative ever enters the mind of the members or leaders of a Methodist class-meeting. Confession as taught by High Churchmen means private confession to the priest alone; whereas all the words spoken in class-meetings are spoken for all present to

hear, and for their profit. Nothing but the conviction that their cause was on the verge of absolute ruin, could have induced High Churchmen to even attempt to prove that John Wesley was a High Churchman by asserting that the organization of the Methodists in class-meetings proved that he believed in that shame and scandal, called auricular confession. By no fair interpretation can even the strongest expressions occasionally used by Wesley about the benefit of "confessing our sins to one another" be made to sanction the Romish and High Church doctrine of auricular confession.

High Church, or Anglican teaching, also means a belief in the real presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the bread and wine at the Lord's Supper; the benefit of prayers for the dead, and Purgatory, and what may seem more astonishing to those unfamiliar with their marvellous advances towards Rome, they now in England are urgently demanding that the clergy remain unmarried, "notwithstanding all the enormities to which the practice has notoriously given rise." (See *Audi Alteram Partem, or High Church*, by Rev. H. A. Smith, M.A., Rector of Tansley, England, p. 112.)

It is clear John Wesley was not a High Churchman in the sense implied by an acceptance of these Romish absurdities, the latter of which has been the prolific cause of crimes for which "the land has been made to mourn."

They take their firmest and boldest stand in proof of the assertion that John Wesley was a High Church-

man on the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. It demands a fair and full investigation, although Wesley's sermon on the New Birth undoubtedly defines his attitude on the doctrine in a simple, clear and positive manner. In order that the teaching of the High Church, and that of Wesley on baptismal regeneration, may be clearly apprehended, some of their clearest statements by their standard and recognized authorities will be presented, and followed by the powerful, terse language of Wesley in relation to this doctrine.

The following quotations will be found in the *Conference of Divines*, p. 102:

The High Church party say, see Pusey's letter, p. 82: "*We are by baptism brought into a state of salvation or justification.*"

Tracts for the Times, vol. i. No. 35, p. 1: "*The sacrament of baptism is that by which souls* are admitted into covenant with God, and without which none can enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Tracts, vol. ii. pp. 12, 13: "That regeneration is in scripture connected with baptism; it is nowhere disconnected from it. Baptism is spoken of as the source of our spiritual birth, as no other cause is, save God."

Tracts, vol. ii., No. 67, p. 14: "There is no hint that regeneration can be obtained in any other way but by baptism."

Tracts, vol. ii., No. 67, pp. 12, 13: "Whosoever has been baptized was thereby incorporated into Christ, and so being made a portion and member of the Son of God, partakes of that sonship and is himself a

child. So that henceforth the Father looks upon him, not as what he is in himself, but as in, and a part of, His well-beloved Son."

I might quote much more of the same character, but this is sufficient to show what the High Church party mean by baptismal regeneration.

But let us see what Wesley taught about this doctrine. Did he believe and teach the doctrine of baptismal regeneration? The following quotations will very clearly show that he did not, but opposed it with all his power.

By putting the matter in the form of questions, and giving the answer in Wesley's words, a clear understanding of his position can be reached. The quotations will be taken from his Sermon No. xlv., on "The New Birth."

Question.—What does Wesley mean when he says, "By water then, as a means, we are born again?"

Wesley.—"When an adult heathen was convinced that the Jewish religion was of God, and desired to join them, it was the custom to baptize him first, before he was admitted to circumcision, and when he was baptized, he was said *to be born again, by which they meant that he who was before a child of the devil was now adopted into the family of God, and accounted one of His children.*"

Question.—But is this *baptism with water*, the regeneration of the heart, or the new birth of which Christ spoke to Nicodemus, when he said, "Ye must be born again?"

Wesley.—"In the Church catechism, likewise, the

judgment of our Church is declared with the utmost clearness, 'What meanest thou by this word sacrament? *Answer*—I mean an outward and visible sign, of an inward and spiritual grace. *Question*—What is the *outward part* or *form* in baptism. *Answer*—Water, wherein the person is baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. *Question*—What is the inward part or thing signified? *Answer*—'A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness.' *Nothing, therefore, is plainer than that, according to the Church of England, baptism is not the new birth.* But, indeed, the reason of the thing is so clear and evident as not to need any other authority. For what can be more plain than that the one is an external, the other an internal work, that the one is visible, the other an invisible thing, and, therefore, wholly different from each other—the one being an act of man purifying the body, the other a change wrought by God in the soul; so that the former is just as distinguishable from the latter, as the soul from the body, water from the Holy Ghost."

Question—Does Wesley hold and teach that by the baptism of water this inward and spiritual grace was imparted to him who is baptized, so that he needs no further spiritual change, but is *truly regenerated*, for this is the doctrine of *baptismal regeneration?*

Wesley—"But perhaps the sinner to whom in real charity we say, 'You must be born again,' has been taught to say, 'I defy your new doctrine. I need not be born again. I was born again when I was baptized.' . . I answer, thirdly, be you baptized or unbaptized,

you must be born again; otherwise it is not possible you should be *inwardly* holy, and without *inward*, as well as *outward* holiness, you cannot be happy even in this world, much less in the world to come. Do you say, 'Nay, but I do no harm to any man. I am honest and just in all my dealings.' . . 'But you must go further yet, or you cannot be saved; still you must be born again.' Do you add, 'I go farther yet; for I not only do no harm, but do all the good I can.' . . And Wesley replies, 'Yet this does not alter the case; still you must be born again. Without this nothing will do any good to your poor, sinful, polluted soul.' 'Nay, but I constantly attend all the ordinances of God. I keep to my church and the sacrament.' It is well you do; but all this will not keep you from hell unless you be born again. *None of these things will stand in the place of the new birth; no, nor anything under heaven.* Let this, therefore, if you have not already experienced this *inward* work of God, be your continued prayer, 'Lord, add this to all Thy blessings—let me be born again.'"

Wesley could not more explicitly deny, and refute the doctrines of baptismal regeneration than he has done in these extracts.

But Cardinal Newman bears testimony to the position of John Wesley on the question of Baptismal Regeneration, which is clear and pointed.

(See *Difficulties of Anglicans*, vol i., pp. 23 and 24.)

"Counsel then, and pamphleteers may put forth unanswerable arguments in behalf of the Catholic interpretation of the Baptismal service . . . in vain

did the eighteenth century use it as a sort of watchward against Wesley."

This means that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is a *Roman Catholic doctrine;* and secondly, that Episcopalians warned people against Wesley and his teaching, because he, like every true Protestant and loyal Churchman, denied the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration and believed it to be the essence of Popery.

Yet High Churchmen claim that Wesley held the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. Regarding the views of Wesley on this doctrine in the case of infants, I will submit some extracts from the clear, cogent and convincing reply written by the Rev. James Lawson to the claims put forth by Churchman, *alias* Layman, which I commend to the careful attention of those whose views on this matter are not fully formed.

Mr. Lawson says: "Before dismissing the subject of baptismal regeneration, I will add a few more remarks on Wesley's teaching concerning it. First, in regard to infants, Mr. Wesley says: "Our Church supposes that all who are baptized in infancy are at the same time born again; and it is allowed that the whole office for the baptism of infants proceeds upon this supposition." . . . .

But now, having proven that according to Layman's own definition of the word "supposition," the language of Wesley correctly quoted does not prove that he held the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, I shall offer a few remarks under the "assumption" that "supposition" does "undeniably prove." Now, what

would it prove? Why, that John Wesley believed just what Presbyter and I and every Methodist minister most cordially believe, namely, that "when an infant is baptized it is at the same time born again;" nay, more, that so far as it is possible for a child to be regenerated or born of the Spirit, that the day before its baptism it was even then born again, and, as Mr. Wesley very properly remarks, "it is allowed that the whole office for the baptism of infants proceeds upon this 'supposition.'" Else we would not baptise them. We baptize an adult person who has not previously been baptized on a profession of his faith in Christ, believing he has been already regenerated or born again. We do not believe the water baptism regenerates him; we regard it merely as the "outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace." The very words imply that there should first be the inward and spiritual grace, before there is the outward sign of it. Surely there must be the existence of the thing itself before the "sign" signifying its existence. As the "inward grace" is "invisible," we have to rely on the profession of the responsible subject, but in the case of an infant we make use of the "sign" with the utmost assurance of the "inward grace," believing as we do from scripture in the universality of Christ's atonement, and bearing in mind the precious words of Jesus in regard to "little children," that "of such is the Kingdom of God." But we believe those words of Christ refer to each and every infant, baptized or unbaptized, otherwise He would most assuredly have made a distinction. Where God

has not put any, we will not dare to do it; nor have we any desire to do so, for as "it is not the will of our Father in heaven that one of these little ones should perish," we rejoice in the confidence that no human, nor inhuman, invention can overrule *His will.*

I will quote one complete paragraph from a letter written by Mr. Wesley to a Rev. Mr. Potter, Church of England clergyman, in the year 1758. He says: "You proceed: 'Our holy church doth teach us that, by the laver of regeneration in baptism, we are received into the number of the children of God—this is the first part of the new birth. What is the first part of the new birth? *Baptism?* It is the *outward sign* of that inward and spiritual grace; but no *part* of it at all. It is impossible it should be. The outward sign is no more a part of the inward grace than the body is a part of the soul. Or do you mean that *regeneration* is a part of the new birth? Nay, this is the *whole* of it. Or is it the *laver of regeneration* which is the first *part* of it? That cannot be; for you suppose this to be the same with baptism.'"

Now, is it not perfectly clear from all this, that Mr. Wesley held the very same views that we now hold and preach? By saying that baptism is not the *first* part of the new birth, as was believed by the clergyman to whom he wrote, it is clear he believed there might be the new birth without baptism, as in the case of all infants, and by saying, "it forms no part of the new birth at all," he clearly shows that one has not necessarily anything to do with the other.

It is not enough that a man be born of water; he

must also be "born of the Spirit." Thus did our Saviour show to the Jews that *their* new birth was not sufficient; that there might be what they called being "born again," which was by water, and still be wanting the real new birth, wrought only by the Spirit of God. With such clear proofs before them, it is impossible for candid men to continue to assert that which is so completely contradictory to the teaching of Wesley as his views, and claim him as a High Churchman. But it is again asked, Was not Wesley a High Churchman in his early life when a Missionary in Georgia? and did he not, when seventy-two years of age write to Lord North, "I am a High Churchman, and a son of a High Churchman?" The explanation of the first is found in the fact that, when John Wesley was in Georgia, he had not yet been made the subject of converting grace, and was vainly seeking for acceptance with God through the observance of the forms and ceremonies of the Church. After his conversion, in 1738, he was really "a new man in Christ Jesus."

Miss Wedgewood, an Episcopalian, in her "John Wesley and the Evangelical Reaction of the Eighteenth Century," puts the case clearly, when she says:

"Wesley's homeward voyage, in 1738, marks *the conclusion of his High Church period*, . . his journals during this voyage, chronicle for us that deep dissatisfaction which is felt whenever an earnest nature wakes up to the incompleteness of a traditional religion; and his after-life, compared with his two years in Georgia, makes it evident that he passed at this time into a new spiritual region. . . . There could

be no more simple expression for this change, than conversion," etc., pp. 140 and 151.

When Wesley was converted, or received the new birth, his High Churchism died, according to the testimony of this Episcopalian writer; and any student of his life will acknowledge the correctness of her position. But why did he write when seventy-two years of age, in his letter to Lord North, "I am a High Churchman, and the son of a High Churchman," if he had abandoned his High Church notions as early as 1738?

It is perfectly clear from Wesley's own words, that he used the term High Churchman in two entirely different senses, one political, the other ecclesiastical. In the political struggle, which was then engaging the attention of all, Wesley took the side of the King, or monarchical party, which, as a political party he evidently recognized as a High Church, or ultra-loyal party; but it is clear that he did not call himself a High Churchman in an *ecclesiastical* sense, from language he used in what he termed, "A calm address to the inhabitants of England," printed two years after his letter to Lord North was written. He is here giving his opinion of ecclesiastical High Churchmen, and from his estimate of them, as here forcibly expressed, it is very evident that he had no thought of putting himself down as a High Churchman. He says:

"Do you imagine that there are no High Churchmen left? Did they all die with Dr. Sacheveral? Alas, how little do you know of mankind. Were the present restraint taken off, you would see them swarm-

ing on every side, and gnashing upon you with their teeth . . . If other Bonners and Gardiners did not arise, other Lauds and Sheldons would, who would either rule over you with a rod of iron, or drive you out of the land." (*Wesley's Works*, vol. vi., p. 335). Who were Laud and Sheldon? High Churchmen must confess that they were true types of the High Church party, and are greatly revered by High Churchmen to-day.

We tread on sure ground when we most positively affirm that John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, was not a High Churchman. For three years more than half a century were his great energies untiringly devoted to the preaching of the Gospel of Christ. In his ministrations he did not tell the sinner that he had received the new birth, and had been regenerated, and made a member of Christ when the baptismal waters, from the sacred hand of a priest in an unbroken line from the apostles, had touched his brow; but he did say to such as trusted in this outward ceremony, "Baptized or unbaptized you must be born again." Nor did he teach the members of his societies that an acceptance of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper necessarily brought Christ into the heart, but his clear and earnest declaration ever was, "Repent of and forsake your sins, and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, with a heart unto righteousness, and you shall be saved."

Instead of frittering away his time in an imitation of Romish ceremonies before a tinselled altar, with bowings and genuflexions abundant, John Wesley was preaching the Gospel to the poor at five in the morn-

ing, in some unadorned chapel, or in some open field; and instead of holding a material crucifix before the eye of the worshipper, he held up a present and living Saviour, to be seen only by the eye of faith, and bade the penitent sinner to thus behold Him and live.

It was only because of the spirit of which he was possessed that he pursued that course in his ministry which caused the Church to "force him into a camp of his own," as is said of him by a Church of England historian.

Place the evangelical, practical, earnest John Wesley in High Church trammels, and again we see a Samson bound with the ropes of the Philistines, who but stretches out his arms and the cords break as threads. Put the spirit of John Wesley in High Church bottles, and again we see illustrated the folly of putting new wine into old and shrivelled bottles. So far from being a High Churchman, which is the narrowest of the parties into which the Church of England is divided, John Wesley was so evangelical that the widest freedom of the State Church was too narrow for his Christian effort, and he was forced to stand outside the boundaries which limit the efforts of an obedient son of the Church.

The Lives of Wesley contain many incidental references to his modes of work, which fully refute the claim that he was a High Churchman which, in later years, is put forth by the Anglicans.

These testimonies give evidence of the most valuable kind, inasmuch as while they entirely free him from any suspicion of High Churchism, they are given

by men who were unconscious that the position which their words overturn, would ever be taken; and that the man whose whole life was a living and earnest protest against sacramentarian teaching should in any age, however distant, be held up as an example of it, was evidently a thought which never entered the minds of his most intimate fellow-workers. When describing Wesley's career during the last years of his life, two of his most intimate friends, Dr. Coke and Henry Moore, say, in the authentic biography which they wrote: "He saw continually more and more of the fruit of his labor, and of the labor of those in connection with him. He laid no stress on opinions or *modes of worship*, desiring only that the love of God and man, through living faith in Christ as God manifest in the flesh, would be the ruling principle of the life, and show itself by a uniform practice of justice, mercy, and truth. He accordingly gave the right hand of fellowship to all who walked by this rule, however they might differ from him in those speculative points of which they are to give an account to God alone." (See pp. 308 and 309).

Could this plain and truthful description of the evangelical character of John Wesley's methods of working have been written if he had been a High Churchman, holding as they do to salvation through the sacraments, and eternal life through a strict observance and practice of a prescribed and fixed ritual, while Wesley "*laid no stress on the modes of worship.*" It is due to the memory of the great and good Wesley that he should not lie under the false charge of being

a High Churchman, and his writings and life-work furnish abundant proof of the falsity of the assertion.

The gross absurdity of the claim that John Wesley was a High Churchman is manifest, when we look at the methods he took to spread the Gospel; not one feature of High Churchism being found in the labors of the preachers whom he sent forth, and whose labors he approved. If he believed in salvation by the sacraments, as High Churchism teaches, it is passing strange that he never demanded that his preachers should teach it; and equally strange that the great Church of which he was the founder and architect, was in his day, and is to the present, one of the most powerful and successful opponents of sacramentarian theology. He who affirms that John Wesley, as the founder of Methodism was a High Churchman, forfeits his claim to more than the most superficial knowledge of Wesley's theology, or his right to be esteemed as a candid investigator.

CHAPTER IV.

What was the Origin of the Church of England?

"WHY herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from hence he is, and yet he hath opened my eyes," were the words which expressed the wonder of the man who was born blind when the Jews disputed about the personality of Him who had performed the miracle. He thought that such wise men as they should know without any doubt one who could perform such a wondrous cure. Still greater astonishment is not unreasonable when the savants of the Church of England give such contradictory and irreconcilable accounts of the origin of their sect. If there be any fact of a church's history of which we have a right to expect a clear and positive statement, it is of its origin.

Of the origin of the Church of England, however, there is in the Church itself such diversity of opinion as is not reconcilable with a pure and simple desire to present the real facts upon which the question rests. I will here state a few of these fanciful theories, and test their claims to acceptance. We are told by Strype, in his *Life of Parker*, that the Queen's Council instructed Archbishop Parker to answer Calvin's letter,

in which he proposed a union of all Protestants, in the following words: that "They liked his proposals, which were fair and desirable; yet as to the government of the Church, to signify to him that the Church of England would still retain her episcopacy; but not as from Pope Gregory, who sent over Augustine the monk hither, but from Joseph of Arimathea, as appeared by Gildas, printed first A.D. 1525, in the reign of Henry VIII.; and so far from agreeing to Eleutherius, sometime Bishop of Rome, who acknowledged Lucius, King of Britain, Christ's vicar within his own dominions." (See *Life of Matthew Parker*, by John Strype, M.A., book ii., chap. 2.) Another view of an ancient church in Britain is expressed by a High Church writer thus: "The fact is, that the Anglican Church was founded in Britain in apostolic times, and probably by St. Paul himself. She has had a continuous organic life from that time to the present day." (*Methodism* v. *The Church*, p. 59.)

Or still another and positively contradictory theory, as held by another sect in the High Church party, and presented by Canon Venables in the article on Episcopacy, in the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, p. 489, where he says: "In England the primitive Church, by whomsoever founded (the Eastern theory is certainly baseless), was undoubtedly episcopal. With the ancient British Church, however, the later episcopacy of England has no connection. The existing Church of England is the lineal descendant of that planted in Kent by St. Augustine at the end of the sixth century."

This Eastern theory, which Canon Venables says "is certainly baseless," is the theory out of which, with modifications, the two previous schemes were constructed.

There is still another theory which, although in fullest accord with all reliable history and reason, is rejected by High Churchmen, which is, that the present Church of England had its origin in the great religious upheaval which began when Henry VIII. shook off the papal yoke, repudiated the Pope's spiritual and temporal authority, and declared himself the supreme earthly head of the Church "in all things and causes spiritual, as well as temporal."

We will examine these theories in the order in which they are here presented, and test their claims to our belief.

The existence of the ancient British Church, with its succession from Joseph of Arimathea, from St. Paul, or Pudens, or from St. John, will be first tested. That the Christian faith was preached in Britain at an early date, and that it was accepted by a portion of the people, will be readily admitted; but that admission does not cover the question at issue, nor establish the claim which is disputed.

The real question, and that upon which the validity of the orders of the ministry of the Episcopal Church of to-day rests, according to this theory, is:—Was there a Christian Church founded in Britain in the days of the apostles having the episcopal form of government, and governed by apostles of our Lord, who communicated their apostolic powers to their suc-

cessors, who in turn handed them down till they have descended to the bishops in the Church of England of to-day, in a direct and unbroken line, called apostolic succession?

Here it should be said that this pretension is such an arrant absurdity, and so contradictory to history, that an apology is necessary for seriously considering it. That apology is found in the unblushing effrontery with which High Churchmen, by totally ignoring history, repeat, from year to year, this fancy of a deluded brain with all the appearance of confidence in its truthfulness that honest convictions should supply. The testimony of historians, secular and ecclesiastical, will be presented.

Before we proceed, it will be necessary, in order to have a clear understanding of the question, to state the reasons by which the High Churchmen are influenced in their efforts to establish their lineal descent, either from an ancient British Church founded in apostolic times, or from the Romish Church through Augustine, and the Papal Church he founded in Britain, A.D. 596-7.

High Churchmen hold that the episcopal form of government is the only scriptural form, and that the true Church of Christ has ever had that form; and further, that to maintain in unbroken connection such a form it is necessary, and has been provided for by the Great Head of the Church, that an unbroken line of succession of apostles be maintained from the original band of apostles down to the present day. Now, in order to prove that they possess episcopacy

and apostolic succession, which mutually interlace, it is necessary that they be in such an unbroken line of succession, hence, closing their eyes to the most fully attested and palpable facts of history, they start out to devise schemes to establish the validity of their claim. It is necessary first to establish the continued, constant and unbroken church existence; and secondly, that they had the episcopal form with an unbroken line in apostolic descent. These points will receive attention, and the declarations of history will be submitted as evidence. Concerning this evidence, it may be said: It will show, 1st. That the present Church of England was not "founded in Britain in apostolic times;" and that no ancient British Church has "had a continuous organic life from that time to the present day."

2nd. It will prove that no line of apostolic succession from an ancient British Church could possibly have been preserved through the 800 years between the founding of the Papacy in England, in 596, and 1533, when Henry revolted from Rome; for this reason, that the Church in England during these eight hundred years was thoroughly papal, and all her bishops during these years, got their orders from the Pope of Rome, and were the sworn supporters of the Pope of Rome, hence no apostolic succession through bishops outside of these Romish bishops was in any sense even possible, thus proving that if the Church of England has any claim whatever to an apostolic line of succession, it must necessarily be through the Church of Rome, and not through an ancient British Church.

3rd. It will prove that, up to the time of Henry's revolt, the Church in England was completely popish, and acknowledged unhesitatingly the Pope's spiritual supremacy, therefore no ancient British Church line of succession had an existence then.

And 4th. It will throw light upon the circumstances connected with the consecration of the first archbishop appointed by the authority of the new Church, in the reign of Elizabeth, viz.: Archbishop Parker, and test the strength of their claim to a valid succession through Rome, which is the only possible chance left them.

The impossibility of possessing a church autonomy, and of tracing a line of apostolic succession from an ancient British Church, arises from two causes.

1st. *There is no historical proof that there was an ancient British Church with an apostolic line of succession.* In fact, the testimony of history is in favor of the presbyterial form of government in the ancient British Church, and it is clear that with them presbyters and bishops were one order, and that presbyters ordained, as I will show further on, by the re-ordination of Bishop Chad by Archbishop Theodore.

2nd. Even if they could prove that an apostolic line of succession existed in an ancient British Church, I will show it was obliterated early, for, to use the words of the historian Knight, "during two centuries the Christian creed was entirely swept away by Saxon heathendom." *This was before the year A.D.* 400. The Christian faith was retained by individuals who, after a time gathered together and formed them-

selves into churches, on the presbyterial form, and in 596-7, Pope Gregory I., sent one of his Benedictine monks, named Austin, or Augustine, with forty other monks, to Britain, and formally planted the Christian faith on the Romish or Episcopal model. He was succeeded in 668 by Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, others having intervened, and to him as the representative of the Pope of Rome all the bishops in Britain submitted. They abandoned all thought of any other ecclesiastical authority than that of Rome, gave up their presbyterial form of government, and he "*reduced everything to a perfect conformity to the Church of Rome.*" See Henry's History of Great Britain, vol. iii. p. 207. The Church in England remained in this perfect conformity ecclesiastically to the Church of Rome till 1533, under Henry VIII, that is, the Church in England was in perfect conformity to the Church of Rome for a term of eight hundred and sixty-five years. Where was the ancient British Church all this time? The irregular forces which composed it were absorbed completely by Rome in 668, and then the ancient British Church ceased to exist. I shall now proceed to prove this from historical evidence.

High Churchmen say: "The fact is, that the Anglican Church was founded in Britain in apostolic times, and probably by St. Paul himself. She has had a continuous organic life to this day."

And what proof do they give for this huge assumption?

Their most astounding argument is, that a lease

given in the time of Alfred was given in the name of the "Ecclesia Anglicana," and that when this lease expired a few years since the property reverted to the English Church.

They must not presume too far on the ignorance of their readers. Nearly every schoolboy knows that Henry VIII. seized the property of the Roman Catholic Church in England, keeping a part for himself, and giving valuable possessions to the new Church he was establishing, and every one who has read English history, knows what a tumult was raised when he did it. Have High Churchmen never read of the Act passed in 1539, in Henry's reign, called "The Act for the Dissolution of Abbeys." Do they not know that in less than five years, two hundred and eighty-one religious houses were forced to surrender their possessions?

The words of the historian Knight are, "The government adopted the principle of terrifying or cajoling the abbots and priors into a surrender of their possessions." This was the way the new Church of England inherited the property of the old Romish Church of England, and this identical lease of which High Churchmen write, was, at the time that Henry began to despoil the Church of Rome of her property, in the possession of, and the undisputed property of, the Church of Rome, then established in England.

But, I will now adduce the testimony of history to prove that the claim that the present Church of England has had a continuous organic life since apostolic times, is absolutely unhistorical.

See Aubrey's History of England, vol. i., pp. 40 and 41:

"It has been remarked, that the claims advanced by most ecclesiastical historians for the existence of an early British Church, must, for lack of conclusive evidence, be treated as a figment,—very beautiful, but very unreal. Divested of the polemical passions which have been excited in connection with the subject, alike on the part of Romanists and Protestants, the question of how Christianity was first introduced into Britain cannot be satisfactorily answered; and on a calm judicial survey, the less that is said about a British Church during the first five centuries of the Christian era, in the modern acceptation of the term Church, the better for all parties. . . . Notwithstanding the high respect properly felt for great names such as Stillingfleet, Usher, Collier, Fuller, and other ecclesiastical historians, a strict regard to truth and to the face of evidence, does not allow of the popular and pretty theory, of a primitive British Church being admitted, until decisive testimony can be found clearer and less fragmentary than that upon which the theory has hitherto been made to rest."

See also *History of England*, by Charles Knight, vol. i., pp. 16 and 17.

Does this historian believe that St. Paul founded the Anglican Church in England?

Knight says of the period about about A.D. 337: "We have no record during this period. . . . of the Christian worship." Where was the Church founded by St. Paul? And again, "*during two cen-*

turies the Christian creed was entirely swept away by Saxon heathendom." . . . Where was this "Anglican Church founded in apostolic times," and which High Churchmen say, "has had a continuous organic life to this day," during these two centuries when the Christian creed was "*entirely swept away by Saxon heathendom.*" Could any pretensions be more preposterous and more contradictory to history?"

Again, in *A Short History of the English People*, p. 29, by the Rev. John Richard Green, an Episcopalian historian, we find him say of this ancient British Church: "But in Britain the priesthood and the people had been exterminated together. When Theodore came to organize the Church of England, the very memory of the older Christian Church, which existed in Roman Britain, had passed away."

Again, the words of Canon Venables occur to the mind, when he says, "*With the ancient British Church, however, the later Episcopacy of England has no connection.*"

The constant contradictions between the High Church champions confuse their readers, for some claim that their only right to holy orders is through this ancient British Church, but those at all familiar with history know the inherent worthlessness of this unhistorical pretension.

These and many more proofs, with which history is replete, prove clearly that when Augustine came to Britain, A.D. 596, there was no organized Christian Church existing there. But though unsupported by historical evidence, High Churchmen have devised a scheme

whereby they hope to link the living present with the dead past by means of a chain forged out of their fruitful fancies. We are coolly asked to believe that this ancient British Church had a line of holy orders direct from Joseph of Arimathea, St. Paul, Pudens, or some one else, they are not quite sure who; that they, amid all the troubles which compassed them for centuries, preserved it without a break in the succession; and, still further, that even over the two centuries, during which the Christian Church was entirely swept away, this wondrous succession made a miraculous leap, and reappeared in full authority and force in the scattered individual believers in Christianity who were found in the succeeding age. But their demands on our credulity are not yet exhausted. They ask us to believe that though the Roman faith and forms were planted in Britain in 596, and held sovereign and unquestioned spiritual sway till 1533, that all through these more than nine hundred years of papal rule the line of apostolic succession, which they say was possessed by the ancient British Church, was preserved intact and uninjured, though buried under papal domination during these weary centuries only to appear when Archbishop Parker was consecrated archbishop, and through him to descend to earth's remotest people.

Again, the boldness with which this assertion is made must be plead as the excuse for exposing it.

I will now show that even if the testimony of history did not prove that there was no ancient British Church continued down to the establishment of the

papacy in England by Augustine, A.D. 596–7, yet that soon after Augustine formed the Papal Church in Britain it completely absorbed the scattered bands of Christians, and that they all submitted entirely to Rome, and became so perfectly assimilated to the Papal Church that it was an *absolute impossibility* that a line of succession, apart from that of Rome, could exist in the Papal Church in England, and for this reason: At the threshold of his office every bishop was confronted with, and made to swear, an oath which completely severed any connection with any other succession and bound him to Rome; and further, this condition existed for more than nine hundred years after the extinction of the last fragments of a Church of ancient British Christians. To prove this I will give the form of oath taken by every bishop during the centuries the Papal Church held sway in Britain. It was as follows: "I, N., bishop of N., from this hour henceforth, will be faithful and obedient to blessed St. Peter, and *to the Holy Apostolic Church of Rome and to my Lord N. the Pope.* . . . To the retaining, and maintaining, the *Papacy of Rome*, and the regalities of St. Peter, I shall be aider (so mine order be saved) against all persons, etc., so God help me, and these holy Gospels of God." This destroys all lines of succession except the Roman, wherever the oath was taken, and it was taken by every bishop in the Church of England from A.D. 668 till A.D. 1533, when Henry VIII. broke the papal yoke.

This, it will be seen at a glance, made the Church in England thoroughly and completely papal, in theory

at least, and as a system positively excluded the possibility of perpetuating any line of succession in the bishops who took this oath, except the Romish. But it may be claimed that it did not in fact have this effect, for this is the only conceivable defence of the position taken by High Churchmen who claim to have a line through the Romish Church of England apart from the papal line.

I shall, therefore, now show that: The Church which was begun by St. Augustine in A.D. 596, and then more fully and perfectly established by Archbishop Theodore, in A.D. 668, was a *Papal Church* in every sense of the word, as an ecclesiastical body; and that it *continued* to be papal till the revolt under Henry VIII.; and further, that this Papal Church was the *only Church in, or of, England, in existence for more than 800 years;* proving beyond all possibility of error that the Church of England can only claim to have derived its orders from the Church of Rome.

This may be thought unnecessary, but in view of the hardihood and shamelessness with which the High Church party endeavor to deny and affirm matters of history as it suits their purpose, it becomes necessary to place historical facts with crushing weight.

Mosheim's *History*, vol. i., p. 398: "While the king was in this favorable disposition Gregory the Great sent into Britain, A.D. 596, forty Bendictine monks, with Augustine at their head, in order to bring to perfection what the pious queen had so happily begun. This monk . . . *laid anew the foundations of the British Church.*"

This conclusively proves, without a word of comment: 1st. That the foundations of the British Church *were laid anew in A.D. 596.* 2nd. That they were laid by men who obtained their power from *Pope Gregory I.* And 3rd, that Augustine, the monk of the order of St. Benedict *at Rome,* was invested with chief power in *England by the Pope,* and that he was the first *Archbishop of Canterbury.* Then there is no pretence of any change till the time of Henry VIII., when the Church of England separated from the Church of Rome.

But our High Church friends claim they have a line of ordination outside the papal, because Augustine was consecrated by the Archbishop of Arles.

To save the trouble of touching it again I will submit evidence that the Archbishop of Arles got his authority from Rome, and that he acknowledged the Pope's supremacy, and the Pope recognized him in return.

Moshiem, same vol. p. 193: "About the same time he (Augustine) sent two of his companions to Rome to acquaint St. Gregory with the joyful tidings of the conversion of England. . . . Gregory received the news of Austin's success in England with great joy, . . . and sent a valuable present of books, vestments, sacred utensils," etc.

See also Bede's *Eccl. Hist.*, book i., chap. 29, for the same fact. But more on this point. See *Apostolic Succession,* by Bishop Ryan, second part page 7: "The see of Arles was founded by bishops sent directly from Rome. St. Trophimus, its first bishop, was sent,

according to St. Gregory of Tours, from Rome to Arles in the year 250," etc.

And quoting from Alzog's *Universal Church History*, the author adds: "It is a matter well known to all Gaul, and to the Holy Roman Church, that Arles, the first city of Gaul, has the honor of having received the faith from St. Peter, through Bishop Trophimus."

And then he makes the following comment: "Whether the translator's learned observations will convince the reader that Arles owes its foundation to the Prince of the Apostles, or not, the discussion proves conclusively that Arles does not derive its succession, its orders, or its mission from Lyons, or from Ephesus, but from Rome."

But to proceed with my quotations to prove that the Church founded by the Pope when he sent Augustine, the Benedictine monk, to Britain in 596, still continued to bow to his spiritual authority.

See the *History of Great Britain*, 3rd ed. by Rev. R. Henry, D.D., vol. iii., p. 191: "With this view he (Pope Gregory) appointed Austin, or Augustine, a monk of the convent of St. Andrew, at Rome, with forty other monks, to go to England, and endeavor to bring the people of that country to the knowledge and profession of Christianity."

See p. 195: "Austin after he had failed in his attempt to bring the British churches under his authority, applied himself to enlarge and regulate the Church of England."

The clergy whom Augustine found in England on his arrival there refused to acknowledge the authority

of the Pope, because Augustine did not rise from his seat in the council as they approached, which they took as a sign they should reject his authority as an archbishop appointed by the Pope. But we will see they soon bowed to the Pope's authority completely.

See pp. 206-7 of same volume: "Vitalian, who then filled the Papal chair, made choice of one Theodore, and consecrated him Archbishop of Canterbury. Theodore set out for England, where he arrived May, 669. . . . Soon after his arrival the new Archbishop *visited all the English churches,* consecrated bishops where they were wanting, and *reduced everything to a perfect conformity to the Church of Rome.*" "Still further, to consolidate this union of the English Churches with each other, and with the Church of Rome, Theodore summoned a council of the English bishops, with the chief of their clergy, to meet at Hartford, A.D. 673. . . . Theodore, who presided at this synod, produced a copy of the Canons which he had brought with him *from Rome,* and pointed out ten of them which were peculiarly necessary to be observed in order to establish a *perfect uniformity* among all the *English Churches;* to all of which he *demanded and obtained the consent of all the members.*"

See *Ency. Brit.,* Popedom, p. 494: "In England the resistance offered by the representatives of the British Church was soon overcome, and from the time of the Council of Whitby, A.D. 664, the teachings and traditions of Gregory, as enforced by Augustin, Theodore, Wilfred, and others found ready acceptance. . . . and a *spirit of filial, though* far from a slavish, *devotion to Rome was everywhere created.*"

Then it is said by Canon Venables of this Church in which a *filial devotion to Rome existed everywhere:* That "the existing Church of England is the lineal descendant of that planted in Kent by St. Augustin, in the end of the 6th century." (See *Ency. Brit.*, Art. Epis., p. 489).

Hence the present English Church is descended from Rome. But, (see Art. on England, pp. 370-71), again where these words occur: "In 668 Theodore, a Greek, was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury by Pope Vitalian. Nearly the whole of the island was now Christian, and all parts of it recognized and submited to Archbishop Theodore." . . . . "THUS ARCHBISHOP THEODORE MAY BE SAID TO HAVE BEEN THE FOUNDER OF THE NATIONAL CHURCH OF ENGLAND."

Let me ask, who is it that is the founder of the NATIONAL CHURCH OF ENGLAND? Canon Perry, in the *Ency. Brit.*, answers: "ARCHBISHOP THEODORE, WHO WAS CONSECRATED ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY BY POPE VITALIAN."

Now, is any more proof wanted that the Church of England before the Reformation, had a Romish succession, and nothing but a Romish succession, according to their own testimony, for the succession brought by Theodore and Augustine, was Romish, pure and simple.

The testimony of the Venerable Bede, whose Ecclesiastical History of England is the first that has any real claim to a fair degree of accuracy, which was written about A.D. 730, proves beyond all possibility of reasonable doubt that the Church of England was

papal, and had its orders from Rome through Archbishop Theodore.

See book iv. ch. 1: "He, Theodore, was ordained by Pope Vitalian in the year of our Lord, 668, on Sunday, the 26th of March, and on the 27th of May was sent with Hadrian into Britain."

Then in chap. 2: "This was the first archbishop whom all the English Church obeyed." Query: When *all* obeyed the Pope and owned his supremacy, where was the old British Church line? . . . "Theodore, visiting all parts, ordained bishops in proper places, and with their assistance corrected such things as he found faulty. Among the rest . . . he upbraided Bishop Chad that he had not been duly consecrated . . . . and he himself *completed his ordination after the Catholic manner.*" (*Bede*, book iv. chap. 2.)

Thus far the evidence submitted from the historians quoted proves—1st. That the Church founded in A.D. 596-7 by Augustine was a Papal Church. 2nd. That the irregular Christian forces which existed in Britain when Augustine arrived in 596-7, which High Churchmen call the ancient British Church, were completely swallowed by, and absorbed into, the Romish Church, in A.D. 668, when under Archbishop Theodore, "all things were reduced to perfect conformity to Rome." As this ancient British Church was perfectly absorbed by Rome, we will next show that the only Church in England *at the time of the revolt* of Henry VIII. in 1533, was a Romish or Papal Church, and that it was the only Church in England at that time that even pretended to have an apostolic line of succession,

and that, therefore, any line of apostolic succession which the new Church of England could possibly claim must be through the Romish succession. In other words I will prove that the *Papal Church in England,* founded in A.D. 596, remained the same *Papal Church* till 1533, and as it was from this Church that the present Church of England derived its orders, they therefore got their orders from Rome, if they have any.

CHAPTER V.

Did the Papal Church founded in Britain in 596-7 remain a Papal Church till the time of Henry the VIII.

HISTORY affords ample proof that the Romish Church in England held undisputed sway in spiritual matters as a church organization from the date of her consolidation in A.D. 668 by Theodore, till Henry VIII. threw off the thraldom to which the kings of England had been for centuries subject. This entire supremacy in things spiritual proves, if it be established, that it was an impossibility that any other church authority than that of Rome was, or could have been, exercised during nearly 900 years, thus entirely excluding the believers in apostolic succession from all hope of a line from an ancient British Church on the one hand and binding them on the other hand to hope only in the Church of Rome for a continued line of succession from the Apostles. I will also show that the claim to a succession through Rome has been and is still held by the Church of England. Sufficient historical evidence has already been given to prove beyond doubt that the Church of England founded in

A.D. 596-7, by Augustine, and "reduced to perfect conformity to the Church of Rome," in 668, by Archbishop Theodore, was a *Papal Church*, and made no pretensions to any other than *Romish spiritual authority*. Now, I will by equally undeniable historical proof show that this identical Roman Church in England remained a Papal Church for 865 years after Augustine founded it, *i.e.*, till 1533, and was a purely Papal Church when Henry VIII. revolted, and began the movement which resulted in the formation of the new church. I will point out some of the differences between the old Papal English Church, which was the established church before 1533, and the new protestant English Church which then arose.

1st. The bishops of the old Papal English Church acknowledged the Pope as the spiritual and temporal head of the Church; while the bishops of the new Protestant English Church swore they acknowledged the King, or Queen of England as spiritual, or temporal head.

2. The old Papal English Church taught apostolic succession, baptismal regeneration, that Christ's body and blood were actually present in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and confession of sins to a priest who could absolve the penitent; while the new Protestant English Church denied one and all of these pernicious heresies.

In other words, the new Protestant Church had a new spiritual and temporal head, new forms of worship and a new creed. This was not simply "the washing of a soiled faced," but a new *existence*.

We ask, is this not *essentially and actually a new Church?* But we are told the new Church inherited the property of the old Church. We ask, how did she get it? Neither by purchase, nor by gift, nor by inheritance. If by *inheritance,* then she is the daughter of Rome! But the truth is that in none of these ways did she become possessed of the property of the Papal English Church, but by *Acts of Parliament without even pretending to give an equivalent.*

Listen to what Hallam, the calm judicial historian, says of the method Henry VIII. took to cause the present English Church to "inherit," as High Churchmen say, the property of the old "Ecclesia Anglicana." Hallam says: "*It is indeed impossible to feel too much indignation at the spirit in which these proceedings were conducted.*" (See page 67, *Constitutional Hist. of England.*)

Thus, this property of the old Church was "*inherited,*" the lease in Alfred's time, of which High Churchmen speak, and all the rest. The less they say about the present Episcopalian body inheriting the property of the old Church which owned it before the Reformation, the better for their reputation as students of history.

And again, on p. 69, Hallam says: "But if the participation of so many persons in the spoils of ecclesiastical property gave stability to the new religion," etc. Spoils of what ecclesiastical property?

Answer.—The property of the ecclesiastical establishment from which it was taken, which was the old Romish Church in England.

Another question. To what "new religion did it give stability?"

Answer.—The "new religion" of the new Protestant Church of England which, as High Churchmen say, "inherited the possessions of the old Church."

What about an ancient British Church now in the light of history?. The plea was that the old Church had not a moral right to these properties, and the Parliament under the King's direction managed the transfer of the property of the old Papal, to the new Protestant Church quite readily. The Romanists then, and now, affirm it was spoliation. There is no argument then, in the possession of the property of the old Papal Church of England. I have referred to this in my former letter, and shown how the new Church got it. I will now proceed with the proof that the old Papal Church, which existed down to 1533, was *thoroughly and perfectly Papal, and only Papal,* at the time when Henry VIII. revolted, and that the new Protestant Church was not simply the old Papal Church after it washed its soiled and spotted face, and as it was from this Papal Church the new Church obtained all the holy orders she ever got, she must have obtained them through the Roman line of Apostolic succession.

Here I will call attention to an important matter in this discussion. The High Church party tell us of the resistance of the Church of England to the Pope's power before the Reformation, and try to prove that the Church did not acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Pope.

Let it be noticed that the quotations prove that the Church in England did fully acknowledge the *spiritual* supremacy of the Pope of Rome before the revolt under Henry VIII. and that without questioning it. Where there was any resistance to his authority and any denial of his supremacy it was *not* his spiritual authority and supremacy, but his supreme authority in *temporal* matters that was disputed.

See *Neal's* History of the Puritans, vol. i., p. 1: "William the Conqueror having got possession of the Crown of England by the assistance of Rome, and King John having afterwards sold it, in his wars with the barons; the *rights* and *privileges* of the English clergy were delivered into the *hands of the Pope who taxed them at his pleasure,* and in time drained the kingdom of immense treasures; for *besides all his other dues* he extorted large sums from the clergy for their preferments in the Church."

This proves that the Pope had control of the English clergy in *secular* matters, in *addition* to his spiritual supremacy, as early as the 11th century.

In order to place beyond all possibility of reasonable denial that the spiritual supremacy of the Pope was acknowledged fully in the English Church before the Reformation, and that the resistance which occasionally manifested itself was solely against his claim to temporal authority, I will quote from Hallam again.

Speaking of Henry VIII he says: "Henry, however, still advanced very cautiously; and on the death of Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, not long before this time, applied to Rome for the usual bulls on

behalf of Cranmer, whom he nominated to the vacant see. These were the last bulls obtained, and probably the *last instance of any exercise of the Papal supremacy in the reign.* An act followed in the next session that bishops, elected by their chapter on a royal recommendation, should be consecrated, and archbishops receive the pall without sueing for the Pope's bulls. All dispensations and licenses hitherto granted by that court were set aside by another statute, and the power of issuing them in lawful cases transferred to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The King is in this Act recited to be the supreme head of the Church of England, as the clergy had two years before acknowledged in convocation. But this title was not formally declared by Parliament to appertain to the crown till the ensuing session of Parliament.

"*By these means was the Church of England altogether emancipated from the superiority of that of Rome.* For as the Pope's merely spiritual primacy and authority in matters of faith which are, or at least were, defended by Catholics of the Gallican or Cisalpine school on quite different grounds from his jurisdiction or legislative power, in points of discipline, they seem to have attracted little peculiar attention at the time, and to have dropped off as a dead branch, when the axe had lopped the fibres that gave it nourishment."—(Hallam's *Const. Hist. Eng.*, p. 61.)

This shows clearly that it was to the claim of the Pope to "jurisdiction, or legislative power in point of discipline," that opposition was raised, and not to his claim as the true successor of St. Peter and supreme head of the Church on earth.

I shall not notice further the resistance to the *temporal* power of the Pope, which did at times assert itself, for this is not the question at issue; yet in order to render any attempt abortive that may be made to prove that the Church in England before 1533 was not under Papal supremacy because there were instances in which resistance manifested itself, I will ask that in every instance in which there was any resistance of the Pope's authority the reader will search the matter when he will find that it was not the *spiritual*, or churchly power that was denied, but the *temporal* power of the Pope that was resisted. He was acknowledged as the *spiritual* head of the English Church till Henry VIII. claimed that supremacy for himself.

We will come down to about 800 years after the founding of the Church by Augustine in A.D. 596, and show from equally undeniable historical proofs that the Church of England remained Roman, and thoroughly Roman, till the beginning of the present Church of England under Henry VIII.

See Hallam's *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, p. 60: "The clergy however felt themselves to be the weaker party. . . . Many of that body were staggered at the unexpected introduction of a title that seemed to strike at *the supremacy they had always acknowledged in the Roman See.*" The clergy here spoken of were the clergy of the Church in England, who had always, according to Hallam, *acknowledged the supremacy of the Roman See.*

Same work, p. 59: "The parliament which met immediately afterwards (that was 1529) was continued

through several sessions, an unusual thing, till it *completed the separation of this kingdom from the supremacy of Rome.*" The Church was, therefore, before this separation purely a Papal Church in England.

P. 62: "The main body of the clergy were certainly very reluctant to tear themselves, at the pleasure of a disappointed monarch, in the most dangerous crisis of religion, from the *bosom of catholic unity.*

What clergy were in the bosom of catholic unity when Henry VIII. broke off from the Papacy? *Answer*—The clergy of the Church in England.

What more proof is needed of the fact that the Church in England was at that time fully Roman Catholic without a trace of the old British Church in it?

But it is abundant. See *History of England,* William Douglas Hamilton, F.S.A., p. 188: "Clement (the Pope) would gladly have received Henry VIII. into the *bosom of the Church.* . . . Finding his power not only unfetterred, but considerably increased since his *separation from Rome,* Henry declared himself the head of the Church, and obtained the sanction of parliament to the *entire abolition of the Papal authority in England.* . . . His first act as the head of the National Church was the dissolution of the monastic houses," etc.

On p. 17 of Macaulay's *History of England,* we find these words: "It was not to be expected that they would immediately transfer to an *upstart authority the homage* which they had withdrawn from the Vatican,"

They had paid homage to the Vatican till 1533, because the Church in England was a Papal Church. These extracts clearly show that the Papal authority in spiritual matters was supreme in the English Church when Henry VIII. revolted, and consequently all spiritual orders came through Rome.

Again, see *History of England*, by Rev. T. Thompson and Charles Macfarlane, vol. ii., page 217. Referring to the reign of Henry VIII. the historian says: "In fact, at the close of this reign the Church of England, although it had cast off *the Roman supremacy*, was still, according to its public formularies and the *law of the land, at one with the Church of Rome in all the fundamental points of doctrine and belief.*"

See again same work, vol. ii., p. 218: "The first year of the reign of Edward VI. saw the fabric of the *ancient system completely undermined, and the foundations laid of a Church Protestant in its doctrines and forms of worship.*"

What ancient system was undermined? *Answer*—The Papal Church in England.

P. 219: "The reign of Edward VI., in the course of which the *Protestant doctrines* and worship were thus gradually but, in the end *completely established*, must have very considerably slackened the hold of the *ancient religion* upon the popular mind. But we believe that it was the reign of Mary, much more than that of Edward, which made England a Protestant country."

What ancient religion? *Answer*—The Papal religion.

See p. 221: "The effect of these new statues was

once more to completely revolutionize the National religion—to transform England from a Catholic into a Protestant country."

What was the National religion before the transformation? *Answer*—The Papal religion. All holy orders through Rome.

See again, to show that apostolic succession and "holy orders" if possessed at all by the Episcopalian body must be from Rome: "A full report of the case of Mastin *v.* Escott, clerk, for refusing to bury an infant baptized by a Wesleyan minister." Sir John Dodson was the Queen's Advocate, and was assisted by Dr. Haggard and Dr. Nicoll. Dr. Phillimore and Dr. Harding opposed. See p. 169.

The Queen's Advocate—"Where does the authority of the Church of England come from? Whence does she derive it? From the Church of Rome?"

Dr. Phillimore—"She derives it from the Apostles."

The Queen's Advocate—"*Through* the Church of Rome."

Dr. Phillimore—"*Through* but not *from*."

The Queen's Advocate—"It is conveyed to the members *of the Church of England through the Church of Rome*."

Here Sir John Dodson, the Queen's Advocate, asserts that the Church of England derives her authority *through the Church of Rome*, and Dr. Phillimore admits it is "*through* the Church of Rome, but not *from* it."

Here I will submit the plain straight testimony of the historian Neal, who wrote his history A.D. 1733

"It was admitted by the court reformers that the Church of Rome was a true church, though corrupt in some points of doctrine and government; that all her administrations were valid, and that the Pope was a true Bishop of Rome, though not of the Universal Church. IT WAS THOUGHT NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN THIS FOR THE SUPPORT OF OUR BISHOPS, WHO COULD NOT OTHERWISE DERIVE THEIR SUCCESSION FROM THE APOSTLES." (Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol i., p. 90.)

We submit, that these quotations prove beyond doubt that the Church of Rome was the only Church holding any pretensions to the possession of so-called Holy Orders during the centuries which intervened between the establishment of the complete supremacy of that Church in Britain by Theodore in 668, and the overthrow of that supremacy by Henry VIII., and that, as a necessary result, no apostolic line of succession could have been perpetuated during these centuries, save that which was in the clergy of the Romish Church; and this is acknowledged by the highest legal authorities who are members of the Church of England. High Churchmen are, therefore, compelled to return to Rome—from whence they came—for the smallest chance of catching, and slightest hope of holding, the much-coveted bauble of apostolic succession. We shall see how strong their claim to it, is from Rome, or through Rome, which is their only hope.

CHAPTER VI.

Has the Church of England a Valid Autonomy and Apostolic Line from the Church of Rome.

FROM the foregoing historical evidence two points will appear clear. 1. It is pure fiction for the High Church party to claim church-life and holy orders from the ancient British Church. 2. It is equally clear that if they have what they term an apostolic line of succession, they can have it only through Archbishop Parker. The validity or invalidity of his consecration is, therefore, to them a life or death matter.

From the evidence history affords, a portion of which will be submitted in this chapter, it is perfectly apparent that Parker and his ordainers were aware of the gravity of the situation on the one hand; and that, on the other, they determined to do all in their power to surround their act with every circumstance which would tend to give it all the appearance of a true and valid ecclesiastical act. They were aware that there was a condition wanting which, on their own theory, invalidated the whole of their proceedings. This might be conjectured from their knowledge of canon law and their familiarity with other services of the

kind; and their silence on that point, while they were so scrupulously accurate in all the non-essentials of the ceremony, as described by Strype, tends to confirm the suspicion. Of this full and irrefragible proof is given when they obtain an Act of Parliament to legalize their proceedings.

Many and strenuous have been the efforts made to prove that all was regular and canonical in the consecration of Parker; but whether the advocates have been unskilful, or the case itself intrinsically and hopelessly bad, it is not necessary at this point to declare, but this is most undoubtedly true, that no apology for its gross and fatal irregularities has yet been presented which has removed from the minds of impartial investigators the impression that it was a bold and bungling attempt of desperate men to perpetrate an ecclesiastical fraud, if by it they meant to secure what High Churchmen call "the line of apostolic succession." Before the investigator examines the grave irregularities connected with that consecration, let him acquaint himself with a few of the requirements of the canon law of the Church into whose line of succession they were endeavoring to obtrude Dr. Parker, and whose ecclesiastical orders they were endeavoring to filch, that they might decorate the intruder with the stolen plumes of apostolic succession. The fatal flaw, according to their own theory—and of which all were aware—was that their own canon laws required that a metropolitan be ordained by his patriarch, or by all the bishops of his province; and in the case of Parker it was not

possible to obtain either of these conditions, and, consequently, the consecration was performed without that which their own canon law declares imperative, and the absence of which renders all consecrations null and void.

The case is well put in the able exposure of this ecclesiastical fraud by Powell, pp. 98-99. Quoting from Bingham, book ii., chap. 16, sec. 12: "No bishop was to be elected or ordained without their (the metropolitan's) consent and approbation; otherwise the canons pronounce both the election and the ordination NULL.

"What will our High Churchmen think of this—a matter determined by the authority of hundreds of bishops in council? Will they say it has Divine right? Then numbers of the English bishop ordinations were NULL *ab initio* (from the beginning) for they frequently were not ordained by their metropolitan nor with his consent. Nay it will DESTROY ARCHBISHOP PARKER'S ORDINATION, upon which all the ordinations of the present bishops and clergy of the Church of England depend. For the canons require a metropolitan to be ordained by his *patriarch*, or at least by ALL THE BISHOPS of his province. NOW PARKER WAS ORDAINED BY NEITHER! but against the consent of the first, and only by three or four, if any, of the last, many of the rest being opposed to his ordination."

Then read the description of Parker's ordination as found in Strype's *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury in the reign of Queen*

Elizabeth." Published in A.D. 1711. Beginning with chapter x. of the first book, he most minutely details the circumstances of the pretended consecration, spreading it over thirteen large pages; but, either intentionally or thoughtlessly, he omits to inform the reader that, according to the canon law of the very Church from which they were professing to secure holy orders, all their proceedings were illegal, and, consequently, possessed no power to communicate the gifts they coveted.

When the painfully minute description of the ceremonies attendant upon this consecration given by Strype in his *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker* is read, coupled with the knowledge that the ordained and the ordainers were all aware of the fact that their action was in direct violation of a fundamental principle of the laws, by professed obedience to which they pretended to obtain holy orders, the impression comes with an irresistible force that the actors were aware they were simply playing a solemn farce. If they believed in the validity of the canon laws by which they were professing to be guided, they knew that, ecclesiastically, the archbishop they made bore the same relation to their true ideal of an archbishop, as the painted and toileted wax figure bears to the living conscious being.

In justice to the memory of Archbishop Parker, it should be known that his acceptance of the office was not in accordance with his inclinations, his judgment, or his conscience. Long and earnest were the arguments with which he was plied before he con-

sented to assume the proffered dignity. In order that his case be fairly understood, he shall speak for himself, as his words are quoted by Strype in his Biography, book i., chap. 8, pp. 35-36: "But especially that he might clog and cumber his conscience to God-ward, before whom he looked every day to make his answer, which he thought and trusted was not far off." He also plead that he "was afflicted with a quartan ague," and he plead with Bacon, "and at the reverence of God entreated him, either to help that he be quite forgotten or else so appointed that he were not entangled now of new with the concourse of the world in any respect of publick state of living." After evading another summons from the Lord Keeper, Strype tells us: "In the meanwhile another letter dated the 30th of December, comes to him from the court which was more peremptory. Wherein the Secretary wrote him in the Queen's name that she was minded presently to use his service in certain matters of importance. And therefore that he (the Secretary) was commanded so to signify to him; to the end, that he should forthwith, upon the sight hereof, put himself in order to make his undelayed repair unto London, and then he would declare unto him the Queen's pleasure. But our Doctor made use again of his indisposition and want of health, to retard his coming so speedily." Again he is summoned, and this time in such a peremptory manner that he dare no longer disregard it or seek for excuses to evade it. Upon his arrival he is informed of the Queen's demand upon him. He thus addresses Bacon and Cecil, as recorded

by Strype: "That unless they moderated and restrained their overmuch good-will in respect towards him, he feared in the end he should dislike them both; and that their benevolences should, by occasion of his obstinate untowardness, jeopard him into prison. Yet he had rather, he said, suffer it in good conscience, than to be intruded into such a room and vocation, wherein he should not be able to answer the charge to God nor the world." Bacon gave him some hint that one reason for his declining to accept this preferment was on account of some foolish prophecies about sad times in the near future, to which Parker replied: "I esteem that fanatical hodge-podge not so well as I credit Lucian's book *De Veris Narrationibus;* nor yet all other vain prophecies of Sands, more than I regard Sir Thomas More's book of *Fortune's Answers upon the Chance of Three Dice Casting.* I would I saw no more cause to fear the likelihood of God's wrath, deserved for dissolute lives, to fall upon this realm, by the evidence of the true Word and by God's old practices." It is easy to see the fear which oppressed Parker in the perilous position in which he was placed, between dread of offending Queen Elizabeth on the one hand, and lest he might be placed in such a position that if the Papists regained power he would pay for his dignities with the forfeit of his life at the stake, as his predecessor Cranmer had done.

But May the 28th brought him a command he dared not disregard. It was stated "that it was the Queen's pleasure that he should repair up with all speed possible; leaving him not to his covenient speed, as they

had done in the former letter." It was no longer optional with Parker. The Tudor Queen with "the iron hand and the iron maw" conceived the thought that his elevation to the Archbishopric of Canterbury would strengthen her position as sovereign of the realm, and neither his scruples nor his fears should hinder her will. He was compassed with difficulties.

Nor did the clouds break after he had donned the archiepiscopal robes, for Strype records the prayer which Parker wrote at that time: "Alas! alas! O Lord God, for what times hast thou reserved me! Now I am come into deep waters, and the floods overflow me. O Lord I am in trouble," etc. We respect the deep and sorrowful emotions of an earnest man passing through a great crisis in his life, but were we bound to believe in the validity of the consecration, we could wish that it had not been in direct violation of the very laws upon which its validity rested, and that he upon whom the apostolic office was said to be conferred had not regarded it with so many grave doubts and such dark forebodings. A fuller examination of the circumstances attending it will possibly show just cause for the gloomy apprehensions of him who so mournfully and regretfully assumed what was ordinarily considered a high dignity, and one greatly coveted. It will exhibit, in brief, the procedure by which the Church of England profess to have obtained apostolic succession, and a valid existence as a Church through Rome's succession.

After they had broken off from the Roman Church, and in the reign of Edward VI., an ordinal or form for

consecrating bishops was devised, and displaced the Romish one then in use. This was done by the authority of the parliament.

On Edward's death Mary, the Romanist queen, ascended the throne, and her parliament annulled and declared illegal, the ordinal of Edward. On Mary's death Elizabeth, the Protestant queen, acquired the crown, and the Church under her headship, made it necessary for every bishop to swear his belief in the queen's spiritual supremacy in the following words: "I, A. B., do utterly testify and declare that the queen's highness is the only supreme governor of this realm . . . as well as in all *spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal*," etc. (See Aubrey's *Hist. of Eng.*, div. 6, p. 621.)

Some of the bishops refused to take the oath which declared a woman to be the "spiritual head of the Church," among whom was Cardinal Pole, Archbishop of York. They had then no archbishop and there was danger that not even the appearance of an ordained ministry on the apostolic succession theory, would be preserved. Then Elizabeth, *a woman*, issued a command that Barlow, Scoresby, Coverdale, Hodgkins, John of Thetford, and Ball of Ossory, that they, or any four of them, should consecrate Parker and make him Archbishop of Canterbury.

The following is the description given by the historian Neal of the consecration of Archbishop Parker: "The sees were left vacant for some time, to see if any of the old bishops would conform; but neither time nor anything else could move them; at length after

twelve months Dr. Parker was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury by some of the bishops that had been deprived in the late reign, but not one of the present bishops would officiate.

This, with some other accidents, gave rise to the story of his being consecrated at Nag's-Head Tavern in Cheapside, a fable which has been sufficiently confuted by our Church historians.

The persons concerned in the consecration were Barlow and Scoresby, bishops *elect* of Chichester and Hereford; Coverdale, the *deprived* bishop of Exeter, and Hodgkins, *suffragan* of Bedford. The ceremony was performed in a plain manner without gloves or sandals, ring or slippers, mitre or pall, or even without any of the Aaronical garments, only by imposition of hands and prayers. Strange that the archbishop should be satisfied with this in his own case, and yet be so zealous to impose the popish garments on his brethren.

But still it has been doubted whether Parker's consecration was perfectly canonical. 1. Because the persons engaged in it had been legally deprived, and had not yet been restored. 2. Because the consecration ought by law to have been directed according to the statute of the twenty-fifth of Henry VIII. and not according to King Edward's ordinal; as that book had been set aside in the late reign, and was not yet restored."

"These objections being frequently thrown in the way of the new bishops, made them uneasy; they began to doubt of the validity of their consecration, or

at least of their legal title of their bishoprics. The affair was at length brought before parliament, and to silence all further clamours, Parker's consecration, and those of his brethren, were confirmed by parliament."

"Soon after the Archbishop was installed he consecrated several of his brethren whom the Queen had appointed to the vacant sees. Thus the Reformation was restored and the Church of England settled on its present basis." (See Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. 1, pp. 89, 90.)

In view of these grave irregularities in the consecration of Archbishop Parker and the other bishops, it is not strange that the majority of believers in apostolic succession doubt, and even vehemently deny the validity of the consecration of these English Church bishops. Nor is it strange that Parker and his brethren did not rest till they obtained an Act of Parliament to declare these consecrations valid according to the CIVIL LAW, so that whether bishops in an *ecclesiastical* sense or no, they were bishops in a secular sense, and could claim their salaries. Nevertheless these consecrations WERE UNDOUBTEDLY INVALID by the canons of the Church.

The Romanists at once detected the fatal flaw, that is, on the apostolic succession theory, and declared that the new bishops were not bishops at all, that the ordinal was insufficient and illegal, and, as Hallam says in his *Const. Hist. Eng.*, p. 95, "he (Bonner, a Roman bishop) had the pleasure of seeing his adversaries reduced to pass an Act of Parliament declaring the present bishops to be legally consecrated," and the same

author says "the ordinal had not been legally re-established." (See p. 95.)

If their consecration as bishops had been ecclesiastically valid, they would have been true and genuine bishops without an Act of Parliament, and had Parker and the other English bishops been certain they had been properly consecrated they would never have sufferred the disgrace of having an Act of Parliament passed to make them, or declare them to be, what they already knew themselves to be. After the Act of Parliament was passed they said, "We are bishops! We are bishops! Parliament says we are bishops," and the Roman party stood tantalizingly by and said to them in reply, "Yes, you are bishops, but you are only Parliament made bishops!"

THE ORDINAL USED IN CONSECRATING THEM.

And again the form of the ordinal by which they claim they were brought into the apostolic line was faulty. It reads thus (See the Liturgies of Edward VI., published by the Parker Society, p. 353):

"Take the Holy Ghost and remember that thou stir up the Grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of our hands, for God has not given us the spirit of fear but of power, and love and soberness."

There was no mention in this ordinal of the *office* or order to which the person consecrated was ordained, it ordained him to *nothing but a general service of God*, and not to a bishop's orders, *and after* 103 *years*, that is in 1662, the English Church by Convocation tried to remove all doubts as to the validity of their

ordinations, by adding to the first part of the form above quoted these very significant words which I italicize: "*Receive* the Holy Ghost *for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God committed unto thee,*" etc.

Now, if the form by which they consecrated Archbishop Parker, and all the rest of their bishops for 103 years, was valid, and all that was necessary to communicate apostolic grace, they did not need to add these very important words "for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God committed unto thee," so many years after.

But as they did think it necessary to add these words, they show that they were not satisfied that the ordinal was a true and valid one. Tried by their own theory their consecration of Archbishop Parker was thus defective, and their subsequent acts prove that 103 years later the Church considered it was a doubtful ordination.

But another question about the validity of their succession thus mended after 103 years. Who lived as a legally ordained bishop for 103 years and carried a valid succession over the gulf which yawned at their feet, till they patched up their ordinal in 1662? No one! And unless we take the theory of Bishop Coxe, their pretence to succession ends here with the attempt to ordain Parker. See his work *Catholic and Roman Catholic*, p. 30, where he says: "Only let it be observed that if any possible flaw could be found in Parker's case the succession communicated to us in two instances by De Dominis, Arch-

bishop of Spelato, in Dalmatia, in the 17th century, transmits of itself a better and more valid succession than that which the Nuncio Bedini conferred on Dr. Bayley, the present Roman Catholic Metropolitan." (He admits degrees of validity. Strange!) Seeing that many doubt the validity of Parker's ordination, Bishop Coxe claims that if their ordinations were worthless before De Dominis made them, he does not say perfectly valid," Oh, no, but he says "more valid than that which the Nuncio Bedini conferred on Dr. Bayley."

Well, what degree of validity does Bishop Coxe say the ordination of Bedini had? See p. 26, where he says: "but neither the Walmsley nor the Bedini ordinations have ANY validity, as establishing a Canonical Episcopacy in this country."

Now we have it just about as honestly as could be expected from a High Church bishop with such a bad case, for he claims that the succession the Episcopal Church got in the seventeenth century from De Dominis makes up for the doubtful validity of Parker's consecration, because it is a more valid succession than that conferred by Nuncio Bedini, which, he says, HAS NO VALIDITY AT ALL.

To put it briefly, after the break in the episcopal succession caused by the irregularity of Parker's consecration was mended by De Dominis, their succession was so much improved that it was better than one which was no good at all. Certainly there are some "difficulties about this succession dogma of the Episcopal Church!" It is not strange that Dr. Southey admitted it could not be proven.

This Rev. Dr. Coxe, Bishop of Western New York, formulates the strongest defence and best apology for this Act of Parliament which made presbyters into bishops, and it should be presented here and examined. Bishop Coxe says: "It made a consecration allowed to be in all respects valid ecclesiastically, to be so by the law of the land; enabling the bishops so consecrated to hold their temporalities."

I have shown that these ordinations were not "allowed to be in all respects ecclesiastically valid," for the High Church or Romish party immediately challenged their validity, and when Bishop Horn, of Winchester, one of the bishops thus ordained, tendered the oath of supremacy to Bishop Bonner, a Roman Catholic bishop, intending to drive him to high treason, "Bonner, however, instead of evading the attack intrepidly denied the other to be a lawful bishop, and strange as it may seem, not only escaped all further molestation, but had the pleasure of seeing his adversaries reduced to pass an Act of Parliament declaring the present bishops to be legally consecrated." (See Hallam's *Const. Hist. of Eng.* p. 95.)

It is perfectly clear that this High Church bishop is contradicting history, when he said that these consecrations were allowed to be in all respects "ecclesiastically valid." As it was IMMEDIATELY, OPENLY and INTREPIDLY DENIED. But to exhibit the illogical character of the pleadings of Bishop Coxe, I will ask and answer a few questions about it:

Q. To whom did these temporalities belong by the law of the land already in force?

A. To the bishops of the church then established in England, which was the present Church of England.

Q. What was necessary to enable one claiming these temporalities to hold them?

A. Two conditions only: 1. That he be ecclesiastically validly ordained a bishop. 2. That he have a valid appointment to the bishopric.

Q. Which was denied in case of Archbishop Parker and other bishops?

A. THE VALIDITY OF THEIR ECCLESIASTICAL STANDING AS BISHOPS; not their appointment by the sovereign to the bishopric.

Q. Can you prove this true?

A. Yes, because the Act of Parliament was passed to declare that "THEY HAD BEEN LEGALLY CONSECRATED AS BISHOPS," not to declare their appointment to the bishopric a valid appointment. Hallam's *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, p. 95, says: "AN ACT OF PARLIAMENT DECLARING THE PRESENT BISHOPS TO HAVE BEEN LEGALLY CONSECRATED BISHOPS," not that they had been legally appointed to the bishoprics.

This makes it clear that the only question was this: "Was their consecration as bishops a valid consecration?" and as they were not satisfied that it was, they obtained an Act of Parliament to remove their doubts. Now if their ordinations had been ecclesiastically valid, they could have held their temporalities by the law of the land as it already stood; but they feared they could not hold them on the ordinations they had received, and hence got the Act to help them; therefore they had fears they were not validly ordained bishops.

But if not validly consecrated before the Act of Parliament was passed, it follows that they never were, for no Act of Parliament, which is a secular court, can make a man a scriptural bishop, which is an ecclesiastical office. Therefore the defence is futile, and Dr. Parker's consecration remains still a broken link in the pretended chain of apostolic succession, notwithstanding Dr. Coxe's specious attempt to disprove the actual intent of the Act of Parliament by which Dr. Parker was made an archbishop.

The testimony of history is that the present Church of England had its origin in "an obscure and proscribed sect usually called Lollards, who, aided by the confluence of foreign streams swelled into the Protestant Church of England." They, the Lollards, had no apostolic succession, nor did they pretend to possess church "holy orders." In the contest between Henry VIII. and the Pope of Rome this sect of Protestants naturally espoused the king's cause. The clergy in the Church who were leavened with Protestant truth now came into prominence, and in the reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth, exercised a powerful influence in formulating the creed of the new Church, and in arranging her form of government. This new Church had no archbishop, and no one who could, according to canonical law, authorize, or perform his consecration. The Lollard, or Protestant element, was easily satisfied with any forms so long as they were anti-Papal. Not so, however, with the Romish, or what we now call the High Church party. As we have seen, the result was a compromise between the two contending parties

—the Lollards, or Protestants, on the one side, and the Romish, or High Church party, on the other.

Macaulay says truly: "To this day the constitution, the doctrines, and the services of the Church retain the visible marks of the COMPROMISE FROM WHICH SHE SPRUNG." (See *Hist. of Eng.*, p. 5, Butler's ed.) As a result of this compromise between the Protestant and Romish parties, an attempt was made to secure apostolic succession from Rome, and a poor farce was played which was called the consecration of Archbishop Parker, and on it they base their claim to a succession through Rome, but which was then, has been ever since, and is now, indignantly repudiated by Romish, Greek and Jansenist churches. This is the way by which "an obscure and proscribed sect" uniting with some Romanists, or High Churchmen, obtained "holy orders," and afterwards tried to have them made valid by Acts of Parliament. This is the method by which they became possessed of that tinselled gewgaw they call apostolic succession, the possession of which transformed "an obscure and proscribed sect" and their Romish allies into "THE CHURCH, with an unbroken line of succession from the Apostles."

What a shameless sham the pretended apostolic succession of the episcopal body is, when shot through with the light of historic truth.

And this is the true condition of this dilapidated ecclesiastical theory of apostolic succession that forms "the stock in trade" of High Church priests! Upon it they expatiate largely in their pastoral visits. But they do not tell their simple and honest parishoners

that the theory has so little to recommend it, that it makes its dupes the laughing-stock of all Christendom; and further that it is so disjointed, so improbable, so entirely unsupported by Scripture, so unnecessary, and so completely overturned by history that thousands upon thousands in the Church of England scorn to accept it, and flout the idea that it has the shadow of a claim for acceptance.

Upon the evidence now submitted, I shall confidently rest the case, and hold that I have fully proven:—

That the Episcopal Church has not received holy orders through an ancient British Church.

That the present Church of England has NOT HAD "a continuous organic life from apostolic times to this day."

That the present Church of England had its origin in the rupture between Henry VIII. and Pope Clement VII., and, as Hallam says, "the Lollards swelled into the Protestant Church of England," and that it was then first made a church.

That the only claim to apostolic succession in the English Church is derived from their former connection with the Romish Church, and this claim is of but little value when tested by the undeniable evidence of history; in fact of so little value, that the Rev. Dr. Coxe, Bishop of Western New York, feels it incumbent upon him to seek to strengthen it, as I have shown, by the orders obtained from De Dominis, which he declared were as good as those Bedini had

conferred on Dr. Bayley, which he, Bishop Coxe, admitted were of no value whatever.

In 1844 the Bishop of Hereford said, "To spread abroad this notion would make ourselves the derision of the world," which strong language is fully justified by the facts submitted.

CHAPTER VII.

Do other Churches admit that the Church of England has an Apostolic Succession such as the High Church party assert they possess? Are High Churchmen themselves satisfied that their ordinations are valid?

WE shall now see how the churches which accept the theory of Apostolic Succession as necessary to church existence, view the claim of the Church of England to such a succession.

Rome rejects the ordinations of the Episcopal Church. "Whatever opinion we may form as to the question whether Parker was consecrated at Lambeth or not, and as to whether Barlow, his pretended consecrator was a bishop or not (these are matters of opinion to be determined by historical research) *it is absolutely certain,* that on account of the form used, Anglican, and consequently Protestant Episcopal orders, are *vitiated and invalidated;* hence, though the Church has acknowledged the validity of ordinations in the *Greek Church,* and, even the validity of the consecration of the *Jansenist bishops of Holland,* and in fact of all who preserved the regular ancient form, yet she NEVER WOULD RECOGNIZE AS BISHOPS OR PRIESTS, THOSE OR-

DAINED BY THE FORMS DEVISED BY EDWARD VI.; and Dr. Milner expresses the mind of the Catholic Church when he says that the form used in the English Church previous to 1662 is just as proper for the ceremony of confirming, or laying hands on children, as it is for conferring the powers of Episcopacy. (See *Apostolic Succession*, by Bishop Ryan, p. 13.) Rome therefore rejects as invalid the orders which the Church of England tried to obtain from Rome through Parker's consecration.

Now, how does the Greek Church treat the ordinations of the Anglican Church. The High Church historian, Dr. Lee, says: "The late Archbishop of Syros and Tenos, even more civil than some of his brethren, re-ordained absolutely, the Rev. James Chrystal, an American clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church (the Church of England in the United States); while the Servian Archimandrite, who once gave Holy Communion to a London clergyman, the Rev. William Denton, . . . was most severely reprimanded by authority, and made to give a promise in writing that he would never repeat that, his canonical offence; and this in a formal document which described the Church of England as *unorthodox and Protestant*, and the clergyman in question *as without the priesthood.* (See *Apostolic Succession*, Ryan, p. 163.) So we see the Greek Church denies their ordination too.

As a matter of fact, THERE IS NOT A CHURCH IN ALL CHRISTENDOM, whether it be episcopal or non-episcopal, that believes in the High Church claim to an apostolic line of succession. Is the High Church party

right, and all Christendom besides wrong? One or the other is right. Which is it?

Here the High Church party stands an ecclesiastical Ishmaelite with its hand against every church, and every church lifting its hand in protest against the false claim of the High Church to an apostolic line of succession. But worse calamities are yet to follow this assumption. The denial of the validity of Archbishop Parker's consecration on the apostolic succession theory, and of the validity of the claim to an apostolic succession is not confined to the other episcopal churches, to the non-episcopal churches, and the evangelical part of the Church of England, but doubts appear to have troubled the minds of the best and most scholarly of the HIGH CHURCH PARTY, AS TO THE VALIDITY OF THE ORDERS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Read the testimony of one of their standard divines. The learned and "judicious Hooker," knowing the worthlessness of the consecration of Archbishop Parker, when tested by the theories of apostolic succesion and episcopacy, "*judiciously*" admits that these dogmas are not necessary to a true church, lest his own church would perish in the crucible of testing. On the 402-3 pages of the edition of 1705, of his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, he says: "In which respect it was demanded of Beza, at Poissie, by what authority he could administer the holy sacraments, being not thereunto ordained by any other than Calvin, or by such as to whom the power of ordination did not belong, according to the ancient order and customs of the Church, sith (since) Calvin and they who joined with him in that action

were no bishops. And Athanasius maintained that Macarius, a presbyter, having not been consecrated thereto by laying on of some bishop's hands according to the ecclesiastical canons; as also Epiphanius inveigheth sharply against divers for doing the like when they had not episcopal ordination. To this we answer, that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient means to allow ordination MADE WITHOUT A BISHOP." That would save Archbishop Parker, and the holy orders of the Church of England, but it DESTROYS THE DOCTRINE OF EPISCOPACY AND APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION!

Again, on the same page this "judicious" divine, and accepted authority in the Church of England utters another equally true, but to apostolic succession equally fatal, statement. Read it in the light of the fact that *every* bishop actually in possession of a bishopric in England, *absolutely refused* to consecrate Parker (See Neal's *Hist. of the Puritans*, vol. i., p. 89), and the "judicious" character of this writer is clearly apparent. He says on p. 402: "Another extraordinary kind of vocation is, when the EXIGENCY OF NECESSITY doth CONSTRAIN to leave the usual ways of the Church, WHICH OTHERWISE WE WOULD WILLINGLY KEEP; WHERE THE CHURCH MUST NEEDS HAVE SOME ORDAINED, AND NEITHER HATH, NOR CAN HAVE POSSIBLY A BISHOP TO ORDAIN; in case of such necessity, the institution of God HATH GIVEN OFTENTIMES, AND MAY GIVE PLACE. And therefore we are not simply WITHOUT EXCEPTION, to urge a LINEAL DESCENT OF POWER FROM THE APOSTLES BY CONTINUED SUCCESSION OF

BISHOPS in every effectual ordination." This admission is necessary to save the consecration of Archbishop Parker, and the so-called holy orders of the Church of England from ruin, but it TOTALLY DESTROYS THE DOGMA OF APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION, for it admits the validity of ordinations performed BY THOSE OUTSIDE THE PRETENDED LINEAL DESCENT FROM THE APOSTLES.

Three things are prominent here: First, the "judicious Hooker" admits THERE MAY BE TRUE ORDINATIONS WITHOUT A BISHOP, thus abandoning the dogma of EPISCOPACY; the second is, he admits that A LINEAL DESCENT OF POWER FROM THE APOSTLES BY CONTINUAL SUCCESSION IS ALSO UNNECESSARY TO A VALID MINISTRY; thus abandoning the error of APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

The third is, that it is extremely improbable that Hooker, who strove through many long pages to *establish* these very doctrines of Apostolic Succession and Episcopacy which he here abandons, would have made these admissions, had he not known that, tested by these dogmas of Episcopacy and Apostolic Succession, the CONSECRATIONS OF ARCHBISHOP PARKER AND EVERY OTHER EPISCOPAL CLERGYMAN, including the "judicious Hooker" himself, were ABSOLUTELY AND PALPABLY WORTHLESS. I might refer to the many distinguished clergymen who have gone from the High Church to the Romish Church, in proof of the doubts the High Churchmen entertain regarding this dogma.

The Right Rev. George M. Randall, Bishop of the Episcopalian Church in Colorado, published a book in

1886, entitled, *Why am I a Churchman?* On the 41st page he admits there may have been as many as ONE HUNDRED EPISCOPALIAN CLERGYMEN WHO, IN THE LAST TEN YEARS, HAVE LEFT THE EPISCOPALIAN CHURCH AND JOINED THE ROMAN CATHOLIC. But he claims this is not many! Perhaps it is not in view of their uncertainty about the validity of their ordinations.

The late Rev. Dr. Ives, Bishop of the Episcopalian Church, in North Carolina, examined the manner of Archbishop Parker's ordination, and became so fully convinced that it was not a valid ordination that he left the Episcopalian Church and joined the Roman Catholic. In his book called *Trials of Mind*, pp. 156-7, quoted by Bishop Ryan in *Apostolic Succession*, pp. 40-2, he says: "I asked myself, who sent Archbishop Parker? . . . When Elizabeth ascended the throne, I saw two powers only who even claimed the right of spiritual jurisdiction in England, . . . the Pope and the Queen. The Pope sustained in his authority by the *whole Church* in England; the Queen sustained by her *Parliament only*. The *Church*, therefore, in England, could not have commissioned and sent this archbishop. *She* (the Church) was utterly against him. . . . Really I could discern no authority earlier than the Queen and Parliament of England. And, therefore, that *my own* commission to act for Christ had its origin in *man*."

And this conclusion, which was reached by this Episcopalian bishop when he examined the mode of Archbishop Parker's ordination, is the only true conclusion which any believer in the dogma of apostolic

succession can reach, by learning the truth about Archbishop Parker's ordination.

It is not strange, therefore, that Bishop Randall of Colorado thought that, when only ONE HUNDRED OF THEIR CLERGYMEN LEFT THEM AND WENT TO ROME SINCE 1876, the number was small, for every one who intelligently studies the question, if he be a believer in apostolic succession, will be convinced, as their Bishop Ives was, "that his own commission to act for Christ had its origin in man," and the Romish Church is then his only refuge, unless he abandon the dogma of apostolic succession.

I will now quote from one of their own High Church historians, Dr. Lee, in proof of the significant fact that well-read High Churchmen, of the present age are as fearful and uncertain about the validity of the consecration of Archbishop Parker, and the canonicity of the holy orders of the Church of England, as was the "judicious Hooker" in his day. The patching by De Dominis, to which it has been subjected, has not strengthened it.

Read the following from Dr. Lee, the historian and champion of Anglicanism, as quoted in *Apostolic Succession*, by Bishop Ryan, pp. 163 and 164: "There are certain difficulties which it must be frankly allowed have always been felt by learned Roman Catholics and Orientals, with regard to the fact of Parker's consecration, and which must be duly faced and removed, before *any recognition of the validity of English ordinations can be reasonably expected from Eastern or Western Churches.* Anglicans must

not remain contented with assertions which *appear* to satisfy themselves, but be prepared with arguments and conclusions which will convince their opponents.

"At Rome every care is taken to arrive at the truth, so that the *inadequate defences* regarded as sufficient and satisfactory by some at home, will never pass muster in the presence of the skilled theologians of the Eternal City. A huge assumption, as Roman Catholics maintain, that all was right in Parker's case is of course easily enough made, but detailed proofs of facts and satisfactory replies to objections, often give trouble, entail research, *and yet remain insufficient for the purpose.*"

Again, the same Anglican historian says: "It is self-evident that the *moral* argument in favor of their (Anglican orders) validity is very strong, *perhaps stronger than either the theological or historical argument.*"

Here, in these words, Dr. Lee, the High Church historian, virtually surrenders the theological, or scriptural, as well as the historical argument in favor of an apostolic succession in the Church of England, and with this surrender that false system lies like Dagon, with its face to the ground before the ark of the Lord, and the head and both palms of its hands are cut off upon the threshold, only the stump (marginal reading, fishy part) is left.

Realizing the worthlessness of their claim to an apostolic succession through the Roman Church because of the grave irregularities connected with the procedure, and in the face of the fact that their ordina-

tions were declared to be spurious, and were treated with contempt by the *Roman Church*, the *Greek Church*, and the little *Jansenist Church* of Holland, and laughed at by every one of the great presbyterial churches for the pride and insolence they exhibited in their pitiful condition, they felt that something must be done to save them and their honey-combed system from dissolution. They, therefore, sadly let go of the skirts of Rome, and frantically grasped at an independent line of apostolic succession through an ancient British Church. The fact stands out before us without any contradiction, that all the Christian churches, Protestant and Catholic, agree that the High Church claim to an apostolic line of succession is totally worthless, and is supremely ridiculous in the light of history.

CHAPTER VIII.

Did the Present Church of England arise in the Sixteenth Century? Is it Protestant?

TO those unfamiliar with the assumptions of the High Church party, it may seem strange that any portion of the Church of England should deny that that Church is Protestant, in the common acceptation of that term, and affirm that it is the Catholic Church. Yet this is their claim, and they press it with a boldness that is astonishing when it is remembered that the records of history are so clear and unequivocal on this point. The beginning of the Episcopalian Church is not lost in the mists of antiquity, nor even clouded by partial or contradictory records. Abundant testimony is available, so abundant in fact is the evidence, that the fanciful and purely imaginative theories which they spin, and with which they satisfy themselves afford occasion for ridicule, and even pity and contempt, for such as accept them, among those who pay even a slight degree of attention to the actual facts relating to this question. We do not think it necessary to prove at length what is found in all reliable history, but will give a brief quotation from that

prince of historians, Hallam, which effectually settles the question as to the origin of the Church of England.

See Hallam's *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, p. 55: "Almost a hundred and fifty years before Luther, nearly the same doctrines as he taught had been maintained by Wickliffe, whose disciples, usually called Lollards, lasted as a numerous, though obscure and proscribed sect, till, aided by a confluence of foreign streams, *they swelled into the Protestant Church of England.*"

Hallam, the great historian, here says the Lollards "swelled into the *Protestant Church of England.*" Notice that it was a SECT of Christians holding, and who had an existence, only because they HELD PROTESTANT DOCTRINES, that swelled into the PROTESTANT CHURCH OF ENGLAND, and which is the PRESENT EPISCOPAL BODY. I call particular attention to the fact that Hallam says the present Church of England had its origin in "AN OBSCURE AND PROSCRIBED SECT, USUALLY CALLED LOLLARDS." Why do they fling the word 'sect" so bitterly against the Methodists when they had their origin in a "sect" themselves, and were only made a "church," in their sense of the word, by Acts of Parliament? Let them bear in mind that their origin was in "AN OBSCURE AND PROSCRIBED SECT, USUALLY CALLED LOLLARDS," AND NOT IN ANY ANCIENT BRITISH CHURCH.

When they are properly informed about their own pedigree, and learn that they ORIGINATED IN "AN OBSCURE AND PROSCRIBED SECT," and NOT in "an ancient British Church," they will lower their heads and cease their foolish prating about "the Church" and "sects,"

as the PRESENT CHURCH OF ENGLAND WAS ONLY A "SECT," till, aided by a confluence of foreign streams, they swelled into the Protestant Church of England, and WERE MADE A CHURCH BY ACTS OF PARLIAMENT, under Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth.

High Churchmen must see that all history is against their foolish fable of their origin in an ancient British Church, and Hallam here positively traces it to the Lollards, "*an obscure and proscribed sect, who swelled into the Church of England.*" Why did Hallam not say that the new Church was only the old British Church with its "face washed," as High Churchmen delight to put it?

The Church of England of the sixteenth century was a child of Providence, as the Methodist Church was in the eighteenth century, and instead of clinging to the effete superstitions of Rome, as the High Church party do, Episcopalians should boldly claim her place as a God-appointed agent for establishing Christ's kingdom.

Tested by the Word of God, the Protestant Church of England bears her Divine credentials written on her banners as the law was written on the tables of stone, with God's own finger, and she carries them triumphantly in the great moral battle field, a puissant and conquering force; but tested by the fictitious, priestly formula of apostolic succession, she is a stranger outside the gate, whose alien birth is blazoned on every page of secular and ecclesiastical history.

The High Church party committed two serious errors

in endeavoring to find a theory to suit their wishes: First, when they claimed a legitimate filial relation to Rome on the anti-scriptural ground of apostolic succession. They then asked to be acknowledged as an ecclesiastically legitimate daughter of Rome, and piteously and supplicatingly cried "MOTHER," but in reply Rome bitterly and scornfully shouted "ALIEN," and the whole Episcopalian family joined in the cry of "OUTCAST," and agreed that by their family test of apostolic succession, the Church of England "*was not of the household of faith.*"

Secondly, after having been scornfully cast off by Rome, and the illegitimacy of their ecclesiastical birth declared by their own mother, the High Church party, after years of insults and degradation from Rome, sadly and regretfully loose their hold on her skirts and stretch out their now empty hands in a vain effort to grasp the garments of an ancient British Church. They, however, only clutched at a mouldy shroud, for this Church, if she ever had an organic ecclesiastical life, had been in her unknown grave, without as much as a stone to mark her sepulchre, for more than a thousand years.

The record of history for the two centuries preceding the coming of Augustine from Rome with his forty monks, is this: "During two centuries the Christian creed was entirely swept away by Saxon heathendom . . . and St. Chrysostom records that the Britannic Isles had felt the power of the Word, that churches and altars had been erected, and passed away like an unsubstantial pageant faded." (See

Knight's *Hist. of Eng.*, p. 17.) In this avalanche of Saxon heathendom which covered the British Isles, the Christianity of the islands found its tomb, and when the Christian faith assumed an organized ecclesiastical form, it was under the Romish missionaries sent by Pope Gregory I. in A.D. 568. Also, the words of one of their own clerical historians, Rev. John Richard Green, before quoted, who says, "But in Britain the priesthood and the people had been exterminated together. When Theodore came to organize the Church of England, the very memory of the older Christian Church, which existed in Roman Britain, had passed away."

And yet from the side of an old grave where its occupant had lain silent in death for more than a decade of centuries, this orphaned and disowned, yet insolent, little High Church outcast of Rome, comes without even a rag of the grave clothes of the ancient British Church, and claims for its mother this Church, which had been dead for more than a thousand years before this illegitimate child of Rome saw the light of day.

That the Church of England had its origin in the Reformation which began under Henry VIII., is clear to all who read the history of that great religious upheaval; yet High Churchmen can be found who shut their eyes to all light and persistently deny it. One instance of this wilful blindness is to be found in a book of sermons to children, by Rev. J. N. Norton, of Louisville, Kentucky, who in a sermon on "Salt," has as his second division: "Ignorance and self-conceit

cannot claim to have much salt in their discourse." This he practically exemplifies in the sentences which immediately follow: "I once heard a man say, who had a great horror of Romanism, 'Well, well; after all it must be the oldest religion. Did not St. Paul write an epistle to the Romans?' He ought to be a first cousin to those who ask, 'Did not Henry VIII. start your Church?'" (See *The King's Ferry Boat*, p. 119.)

History undeniably affirms that the Church of England had its origin in the Reformation under Henry VIII., and Hallam traces it still more accurately and definitely to "a proscribed and obscure sect, called Lollards, who, aided by a confluence of foreign streams, swelled into the Protestant Church of England." But as they deny they are Protestants, in the common acceptation of the term, proof must be furnished to establish that fact also. It must be borne in mind that there were two factions in the early Church —one Romish, and the other Protestant, as we find them to-day. Occasionally the Romish party would gain a point in the struggle and stamp some feature of Romanism on the Protestant Church of England, but the great Protestant character of the Church they could not destroy. I will, however, now quote the words of a High Church writer, who says: "The Church of England is not Protestant, in the common acceptation of the term, but Catholic" (see *Methodism* vs. *The Church*, p. 52), and I shall prove it to be High Church teaching. I will define his meaning, show why High Churchmen take that position, and then

prove it to be absolutely at variance with fact, and by abundant historical and convincing proof show that the real Church of England is a true Protestant Church. 1st. As to his meaning. He here assumes that the Church of England of to-day did not have its origin in the great Reformation of the sixteenth century, under Henry VIII., Edward VI. and Elizabeth, and was not a part and parcel of that mighty culmination of religious efforts in which the assumptions of the Papacy were boldly and successfully PROTESTED against; in other words, he claims their succession through an ancient British Church, and hence must deny that the true historical origin of the English Church was in the great Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century, LEST HE MAY BE INCLUDED AMONG THOSE WHO PROTESTED AGAINST THE ERRORS OF ROME.

2nd. But why prefer the ancient British Church theory to the Protestant Church of England theory?

I reply, and will prove my reply the correct one. Because the restless Romanizing High Church party, of which this writer is a member, desires to teach, under the authority of the Church of England, many doctrines held by the Roman Church, and AGAINST WHICH THE PROTESTANT CHURCH OF ENGLAND PROTESTED IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY; and by going back of the Reformation and Henry VIII., they CAN find in the teaching of the Church of England the false doctrines they long to see prevail again, and the reason they can find these errors of Apostolic Succession, Real Presence, Baptismal Regeneration, etc., is because the Church of England before the Reforma-

tion, which openly began under Henry VIII., was COMPLETELY ROMAN CATHOLIC, AND ONLY ROMAN CATHOLIC.

We have come to this point, the High Church party deny and discard the glorious old word PROTESTANT purely because they long after the Romish teachings against which THE REAL, THE TRUE, THE GRAND OLD PROTESTANT CHURCH OF ENGLAND PROTESTED, and in defence of which many of her martyred saints perished in the flames of Smithfield.

Now to the last point, IS THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PROTESTANT? High Churchman says it is not Protestant, in the common acceptation of that term, which means it did not arise as a part of the great Reformation in the sixteenth century.

I will prove—1st. Its originators took their stand on the identical principles upon which the Reformation was based, and which underlie the Protestantism of to-day; 2nd. That the bishops and leading divines of the early English Church adopted these principles and took the name "Protestant" for their doctrine and for their new Church organization, when writing about it; and 3rd. Prove that in some of the most important Acts of Parliament in that age, in the succeeding ages, and in our own time, when the Church of England is mentioned, it is called Protestant, if necessary to express its position on that question; and lastly, that even in our own time when the bitter word "Protestant" is sugar-coated with a PECUNIARY advantage, even High Church priests can gulp it down, and calmly wipe their mouths and say, "We have not

sinned." For instance, when the Clergy Reserves Act was passed, granting certain lands in Canada for the partial support of a "Protestant Clergy," High Churchmen found the bolus, not perhaps pleasant to the eye, but yet not bitter to the taste, and they greedily grabbed all that came in their way, even though the Act stated these reserves were only for "Protestant Clergy."

It seems they are "Anglo-Catholics," when formulating their creed, but "Protestants" when foraging for plunder. They are, to adopt Huxley's description of a certain school of scientists, "a sort of half-breed, endowed like most half-breeds with the faults of both parents and the virtues of neither."

But now as to the identity of the principles of Protestantism with those which were placed as the foundation of the English Church in the reigns of Henry, Edward and Elizabeth. First, I will prove that the principle against which the nobles of Germany protested, when the name "Protestant" was first applied, is the identical principle against which the founders of the Church of England protested.

Proof—The word Protestant was, in this connection, first applied to the nobles of Germany who, at the Diet of Spires, in 1529, "protested" against the power claimed by the Pope to forbid a member of the Roman Catholic Church to change his creed; in other words, they protested against the spiritual supremacy of the Pope. (See Berti's *Eccl. Hist. Breviarium*, quoted in *Princeton Review*, 1837, Art. *Protestantism.*) Now read the words of the oath in the Act of Supremacy

required by Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, in the beginning of the existence of the Church of England:— "I, A B, do utterly testify and declare that the Queen's Highness is the only supreme governor of this realm as well in all SPIRITUAL and ECCLESIASTICAL things or causes, as temporal," etc. (See Aubrey's *Hist. of Eng.*, div. 6, p. 621.) Here the same principle is the keystone of the new Church, a protest against the spiritual supremacy of the Pope, hence PROTESTANT.

Again, the Church of England in the 37th article does now embody this PROTEST against the supremacy of the Pope in these words: "The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other of her Dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they BE ECCLESIASTICAL OR CIVIL, IN ALL CAUSES DOTH APPERTAIN, AND IS NOT, NOR OUGHT TO BE, SUBJECT TO ANY FOREIGN JURISDICTION." Here is the same principle again affirmed, viz.: a PROTEST AGAINST THE SPIRITUAL SUPREMACY OF THE PAPACY. Why say the Church is not Protestant, in the common acceptation of the term, in the face of these historical and present-day facts? I have already proven that leading divines of the early English Church protested against the papal doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, and if necessary could prove they also protested against other Popish heresies, such as the Confessional, Apostolic Succession, the Real Presence—the errors against which the Protestants in the Church of England protest to-day, and which were also protested against by the Protestants on the Continent.

I will quote from the preface to the *New Interpretation of the Apocalypse*, by the Rev. G. Croly, LL.D., Rector of St. Stephen's, Walbr ok, London, in Tract No. 8 of the Protestant Association's Publications. His words directly contradict High Church assertions. Firstly, that the present English Church was not begun in the reign of Henry VIII. and solidified under Edward VI. and Elizabeth. The reverend rector says: "Protestantism was first thoroughly established in England in the reign of Elizabeth," therefore the present Church of England is Protestant; and, secondly, it follows that the Church was *Protestant*, which was established in England when "Protestantism was first thoroughly established" in England. And again he says: "But the cause of Elizabeth was Protestantism: and in that sign she conquered." . . . "She fought the battles of the French Protestants." And again, "But her great work was the establishment of Protestantism." And again he says, "She died in the fulness of years and honor; the great Queen of Protestantism throughout the nations." Yet High Churchmen say, "the Church of England is not Protestant, in the common acceptation of the term, but Catholic."

Speaking of James I., the Rev. Dr. Croly, abovementioned, says, "his first act was to declare his allegiance to Protestantism." Of Charles I., he says: "But Charles betrayed the sacred trust of Protestantism." Of Cromwell, he says: "But whatever was in the heart of the Protector, the policy of his government was Protestantism." Of William the Prince of Orange, he says: "William was called to the throne by Pro-

testantism," "the principles of William's government was Protestantism." Of the Royal House of Brunswick, he says: "The Brunswick line were called to the throne by Protestantism. THEIR FAITH WAS THEIR TITLE. They were honorable men and they kept their oaths TO THE RELIGION OF ENGLAND." What faith was their title? Answer: The Protestant faith; for the Act of Settlement makes it imperative that the sovereign be a Protestant. And what was "the religion of England" to which the kings of the Brunswick line kept their oaths?—THE PROTESTANT RELIGION.

In all these instances this learned expositor, a rector in the English Church, uses the term "Protestant, in the common acceptation of the term," as protesting against the supremacy of Rome, and other erroneous doctrines of the Papacy, and applies it to the Episcopalian Church in England.

Again, I will quote extracts from the Act of Settlement, as given in Hamilton's *Hist. of Eng.*, p. 429: "That whereas it hath been found by experience to be inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this PROTESTANT Kingdom to be governed by a popish prince, or by any king or queen marrying a Papist, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons do further pray that it may be enacted that all and every person who shall be reconciled to the Church of Rome, or shall marry a Papist, shall be excluded and be forever incapable to inherit the crown of government of these realms, or to exercise any regal power, authority or jurisdiction within the same; and in all and every such case the people shall be and are hereby absolved

of their allegiance; the crown to descend to such person or persons, being PROTESTANTS, as should have inherited the same in case the person or persons so reconciled, or marrying as aforesaid were naturally dead."

The King or Queen of Great Britain must then be a Protestant, and the Church of which the King or Queen of England is the head, is Protestant also, according to this law of the realm. Why deny, then, that the Church of England is Protestant?

One more proof to establish what no one should for one moment deny. See *Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies*, pp. 305-306, by Alpheus Todd: "In Canada by the Imperial Act 31, Geo. III. c. 31, passed in 1791, the Church of England was partially established and 'Protestant Clergy' thereof partially endowed, by grants of land reserved for their support. But this gave rise to much strife and controversy. Presbyterians and other non-Episcopalian communions claimed equal rights, both civil and religious, in the British Colonies; and this could not be withstood or gainsaid. In 1840 the judges of England gave a unanimous opinion to the House of Lords that the words, 'a Protestant Clergy' in the Statute 31 Geo. III. c. 31, are large enough to include, and that they do include, other clergy than those of the Church of England."

Here were valuable grants of land given to PROTESTANT CLERGY, and for years they were greedily swallowed by the clergy of the Church of England, who then declared they were the ONLY PROTESTANT CLERGY

in Canada, and denied that other clergymen, such as Presbyterians, had any right to be called PROTESTANT clergymen in a legal sense. Yet High Churchmen say now that the Church of England is not Protestant, in the common acceptation of that term. Were there more "loaves and fishes" for distribution among the "PROTESTANT CLERGY," would our dear brethren of the Episcopalian Church modestly decline to accept a share on the plea that "they are not Protestants, in the common acceptation of the word?" I think not.

I have given these numerous references to prove that the word "Protestant" was applied to the Church of England in most important Acts of Parliament, in the earliest age of the Church, as well as in the present, and also to prove that their own writers claimed that word as defining their Church; also that even High Churchmen accepted it when the Clergy Reserves were to be obtained by doing so; and I shall now show that it, when applied to that body, meant the peculiar DOCTRINES which they held. To prove this, and at the same time to show the origin of the Church of England in its ecclesiastical life as well as doctrine, I will quote again from Hallam (see *Const. Hist. of England*, p. 55). He says: "Almost a hundred and fifty years before Luther, nearly the same doctrine as he taught had been maintained by Wickliffe, whose disciples, usually called Lollards, lasted as an obscure and proscribed sect, till, aided by the confluence of foreign streams, THEY SWELLED INTO THE PROTESTANT CHURCH OF ENGLAND." Here Hallam affirms the origin of the doctrinal teachings of the

Church of England to be the teachings of Wickliffe, which, he says, were nearly the same as the teachings of Luther, and every one knows that that means Protestant doctrines. And he further says that these Lollards who held these Protestant doctrines swelled into the Protestant Church of England; therefore the Church of England is Protestant in doctrine. Any variation from the doctrines of Protestantism in the Church of England came in, as I have said before, with the Romanizing party in the Church. To sum up these proofs:—

1st. The Church of England was founded upon the very principles which gave rise to the word "Protestant."

2nd. These principles were acknowledged and embodied in the oath of supremacy under Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth, at the founding of the present Episcopal Church.

3rd. The term PROTESTANT is incorporated in the Act of Settlement by which our Kings and Queens hold their title to the throne of Great Britain and the allegiance of the people.

4th. The leading divines of the early English Church protested against the doctrines of Apostolic Succession, Baptismal Regeneration, Confession, the Real Presence, and other false doctrines known commonly as Papal.

5th. The clergy of the Church of England for several years took ALL the Clergy Reserves granted for the support of "a Protestant Clergy in Canada," on the claim that they were "the only Protestant Clergy in Canada," and absolutely refused to give any part to

other Protestant clergymen till forced by an Act of Parliament to disgorge a portion of the plunder they had secured under the plea that they were "the only Protestant Clergy" in Canada. Yet in this age men can be found to declare in the face of all this crushing evidence that "the Church of England is not Protestant, in the common acceptation of that term." It is only the High Church faction that denies the grand old historic name, and foolishly apes Papal mummeries.

6th. Lastly, the plain and undeniable evidence of one of England's greatest historians, Hallam, who gives the doctrinal, as well as ecclesiastical, origin of the Church of England, and shows it to be Protestant in its very inception.

The real Church of England is Protestant to the core, and does not blush to acknowledge the name. The claim that the Church of England is the Catholic, or Universal Church, is too childishly absurd to demand more than passing notice.

It is a part of the Catholic Church, and only a part. In face of the fact that it is largely outnumbered by the other branches of the true Church of Christ, it is simple in the extreme to ask any one of the most ordinary intelligence to believe it is the Universal Church of Christ.

We have never yet learned that a part, and only a small part at that, is equal to the whole. I hope High Churchmen will not deny the veracity of geometrical axioms, as they have discredited all reliable history. There is a limit to the credulity of even the

most bigoted, and they will lose many they now hold if they tax their faith too severely.

I submit these quotations prove beyond the possibility of successful contradiction, that the Church of England, as founded in the sixteenth century, is essentially Protestant, in the common acceptation of that word, notwithstanding the ceaseless efforts of the High Church party to Romanize it.

History leaves no uncertainty upon either of these questions, but fully and unequivocally shows that the Church of England had its origin in the great Reformation which began under Henry VIII. in the sixteenth century; and also that the Church of England is essentially Protestant, in the common acceptation of that term.

CHAPTER IX.

Is High Churchism Romanism?—Extracts from High Church Manuals.

FROM what has preceded, it is clear that the present Church of England, which originated in the sixteenth century, is a Protestant Church, and any variations from the tenets which are commonly known as Protestant doctrine, which appear in its teaching, have been brought in by the Romanizing party, as one of the results of the compromise in which the Church had its origin.

For several years past most strenuous and daring attempts to Romanize this branch of Christ's Church have been exhibited, and there is no cessation of their efforts, even at the present. They deny that they are imitating Rome; but Rome, and the Christian world, know perfectly well that such is the case.

They profess to aim at the restoration of ancient and scriptural modes of worship, yet, strange to say, that when they reach their highest aim, it is, as the Bishop of Manchester says, "impossible to distinguish their teaching and ritual from that of Rome." But where they cannot prudently adopt in full the ritual and practices of Rome, they pitifully cry out, that they are misrepresented and persecuted by such as

expose their teaching and show them to be Romish perversions of the teachings of God's Word.

If they teach Romish errors, I am only doing, what any one who reveres the "faith once delivered unto the saints," should do, viz., exposing heresy, and heretical teaching. I submit the following facts as proof that where the High Church teaching differs from Protestant teaching, it teaches Romish doctrine, or, that High Churchism is Romanism under a very thin disguise.

I will quote from authorities in the Church of England, and even bishops, as well as from others, whose testimony they dare not impeach, and if I prove High Churchism leads to Rome, let them not complain that Protestants are warned against their false teaching; but rather let them "cease to do evil and learn to do well" in the future.

Let them be true to Protestantism and God's Word, and all Protestants will rejoice over their conversion to the truth. On the other hand, they may rest assured that true Protestants will not hold their peace and allow High Churchmen to practise the vain tricks they call religious worship, in imitation of their Romish mother, and yet continue to wear the livery and eat the bread of a Protestant Church. They must not think that private appeals for sympathy on the claim that they are falsely accused of teaching Romish error, will satisfy the public that the charges I here make are untrue. I shall prove that High Church teaching includes the Romish errors of Baptismal Regeneration, Apostolic Succession, the Real Presence of Christ's flesh

and blood in the bread and wine at the Lord's Supper, and also the doctrine of Private Confession of sins to a priest, accompanied by a pretended absolution by the priest, for sins confessed, and also celibacy and prayers for the dead. This I shall proceed to establish by quotations from unimpeachable sources.

I shall produce proof found in the books used in High Church Sunday-schools, and which have official authority for their Romish teaching. I will quote from a book now before me. I will copy the title page in full, so that there can be no quibbling or evasion about its authority:

Series of Instruction Books for Sunday Schools, edited by the Right Reverend William Croswell Doane, S.T.D., Bishop of Albany.

Manual of Christian Doctrine, according to the Church Catechism, adapted to the Christian Year and in Three Uniform Grades. By the Rev. Walker Gwynne.

"Rooted and built up in him, and stablished in the faith." (Col. ii. 7.)

I will quote from the *Senior Grade,* and show how the best "instructed Sunday-school scholars in the Church of England" are taught Romish doctrines.

Q. What is the office or work of a prophet?

A. To declare with authority the will of God to man; sometimes also to foretell future events.

Q. Does Christ ever exercise His office of a prophet through others?

A. Yes; through His ministers in Apostolic Succession, etc. (See page 14.)

Here is the Romish doctrine of Apostolic Succession, which has been, and is now, denied and rejected by the Protestant part of the Church of England.

HIGH CHURCHISM IS ROMANISM.

Now for Baptismal Regeneration, which is a Romish doctrine.

Q. What name did you receive from the Church?

A. My Christian name.

Q. Why do you say that you received it from the Church?

A. Because the minister of the Church first named me by it when I was christened, OR MADE A CHRISTIAN. (See page 19.)

Q. What nature and name did you receive at your baptism?

A. I WAS BORN AGAIN "into the family of Jesus, the new man, or second Adam, and received His name, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named. (See page 20.)

Yet some say the High Church *does not teach* that a child is born again at his baptism! Here it is clearly stated that he is then "born again."

Q. When you were baptised, of whom were you made a member?

A. I was made a member of Christ. . . .

Q. What is it that can ALONE make you a member?

A. HOLY BAPTISM. (John iii. 5, p. 23.)

Q. And what did baptism do for you?

A. IT MADE ME A MEMBER OF CHRIST, AND THUS BROUGHT ME INTO THE FAMILY OF GOD. (P. 31.)

Can any one deny now that High Church teaching is that the heart is changed by baptism, in the face of these extracts from an authorized publication? And immediately there follows these questions and answers:

Q. What besides did it do for you?

A. It gave me the FIRST GIFT of God's Holy Spirit.

Then on p. 33.

Q. What besides a member of Christ were you made in baptism?

A. THE CHILD OF GOD.

These quotations prove that the teaching of the High Church is that by baptism ALONE one "is MADE A MEMBER OF CHRIST." THE CHILD OF GOD and "BORN AGAIN." Christ taught that the change was wrought by the Spirit of God, when we trust with TRUE FAITH IN HIM AS OUR SAVIOUR. "He that BELIEVETH on the Son hath eternal LIFE." The apostle said to the jailer *before he was baptized*, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," and then AFTER he believed, and had been born again through faith, he baptized him. High Church teaching is thus clearly opposed to Scripture, and ought to be condemned. HIGH CHURCHISM IS ROMANISM.

Now for the comparative authority of the Scriptures and the Church.

Q. From whom do we get the creed?

A. From the Church.

Q. From whom do we get the Bible?

A. From the Church. (See p. 54.)

Q. Is it true that the Church is founded upon the New Testament?

A. No; the Church was founded on, and by the Lord Jesus Christ, before a word of the New Testament was written. His ministers preached, baptized, confirmed, and administered the Holy Eucharist for nearly seventy years before the New Testament was completed.

Q. What then is the relation of the Church to the Scriptures of the New Testament?

A. THE SCRIPTURES ARE FOUNDED UPON THE CHURCH, INSTEAD OF THE CHURCH BEING FOUNDED UPON THE SCRIPTURES. (See pp. 116 and 117.)

To show the falseness of this teaching it is only necessary to call to mind that the faith of all Christians is that the Scriptures are the WRITTEN will of God, and that the *truth they contain* was just as fully the will of God to man when it was *spoken* by inspired men, as when it was afterwards *written* down; in fact, the word spoken and the word written, are ONE, and the only known will of God, and it is as small a quibble to say that ALL the Scriptures were not written till seventy years after Christ founded His Church, as it is false to say the Scriptures were founded upon the Church. God's truth is the foundation of His Church, whether the truth be spoken or written, and it is essentially and fundamentally false and dangerous to say that the *Scripture,* which is God's truth committed to writing, is founded upon the Church. And for this reason, *the Church did not reveal* God's truth, but "Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" not as they were moved by "*the Church,*" as High Church teaching would imply. They

also spake *individully*, not *as* a Church, and they spake *to the Church* by the authority of *God*, not *to the world* by the authority of the *Church*. But High Churchmen do not profess to be Protestants, so we must not wonder that they, like the Romanists, declare that the Church is superior to the Scripture, as they do, when they claim that the Scripture is founded upon the Church. *High Churchism is Romanism.*

But to continue the quotations from this High Church Manual.

Q. Is there any danger of this line of succession (apostolic) ever having been broken ?

A. No; we are SURER of it than we are THAT OUR BIBLES OF TO-DAY ARE THE TRUE SUCCESSORS OF THE FIRST BIBLE. (Page 134.)

High Church teaching, then, is that we are *not sure* that our present Bible is really the Word God did actually reveal, but they are PERFECTLY SURE that their line of Apostolic Succession has never been broken. Or, in other words, God has guarded Apostolic Succession more sacredly than he has preserved His own Revealed Word.

And this is called Religious teaching !

Now, as this authorized High Church Manual teaches that the New Testament Scriptures are founded upon the Church, let us ask for its definition of a Church, till we see the foundation upon which the Scriptures rest according to their theory.

Q. What is His Church ?

A. A company of people who believe in Him as the Son of God, and are baptized. (See p. 23.)

Therefore the teaching of the High Church is that the New Testament Scripture is founded upon "a company of people who believe in Christ as the Son of God, and are baptized," whereas all Protestants know that the New Testament Scriptures are based upon *the fact that God revealed the truth they contain.* And further it was not revealed by God to the Church as an organic body; but to inspired men INDIVIDUALLY, and they were commanded to teach it to those who listened to their preaching; and the body of believers were *to be subject to,* and *obey* the word taught them. They submitted themselves to God's revealed word spoken by inspired men *before* it was written, without for one moment pretending that the Scriptures were founded on them, a company of believers. They would have stood aghast at such blasphemy of the Word, as the apostles did when deluded fanatics of their day wanted to pay them worship, and rob God of the glory due to Him.

Yet such teaching must be necessary to support the false system adopted by High Churchmen, or they would not expose themselves to contempt by accepting them. It is the courage of necessity that leads them to espouse such absurdities.

Now what do High Churchmen teach about confession to a priest?

Q. Why should we confess particularly to a minister?

A. On principles of common sense; for, first of all, a minister of Christ, being one whose business is the saving and oversight of souls, is the most likely to

guide us aright; and, secondly, the ministers of Christ are commissioned ministers of reconciliation, who have the POWER OF ABSOLUTION COMMITTED TO THEM.

Q. Who is to decide whether to allow a confession to a PRIEST?

A. THE MINISTER HIMSELF, etc. (P. 152 and 153.)

And private confession of sins to a priest who pretends to absolve the penitent is practised in the High Church party NOW.

Here is the confessional in High Church teaching. Listen to the language of one who accepted, and practised High Church teaching, about private confession to a priest. When "fully instructed" he saw that "when confessing to a priest he was confessing to Our Lord Himself."

"I looked on the priest as a commissioned minister," (that is, before he was fully instructed), "and I did not see that it was *Our Lord Himself* to whom I was confessing, and who was speaking to me; nor did I see *as I have seen since*, that the confessor's words are not his own, but that he is under *the control of one who regulates them in a way of which the priest himself is generally unconscious.*" Quoted from "Autobiography in the Church and the World," by Rev. Dr. Vaughan, in "Ritualism in the English Church." (P. 84.)

This is the teaching of the High Church on the confessional. Truly High Churchism is Romanism.

Now look at High Church teaching about the REAL PRESENCE of Christ's BODY in the bread and wine.

First, I will show that what they mean by Christ's

spiritual body, is the body composed of "flesh and bones," which He had AFTER HIS RESURRECTION, during the forty days He REMAINED ON EARTH BEFORE HIS ASCENSION, and NOT the SPIRITUAL body He now has in heaven; and who that reads 1 Cor. xv. 50, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," will presume to say that Christ has now in heaven the identical body of which He said in Luke xxiv. 39, "handle Me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have," and that that body of flesh and bones is His spiritual body. Yet this is taught by High Churchmen. I quote from the same work as before.

Q. Will our bodies be raised up in the same condition?

A. No; they will be raised up spiritual bodies.

Q. What does this mean?

A. Bodies that are endowed with the power of spirits.

Q. What was the condition of our Lord's body after He ROSE?

A. It was a spiritual body. (Page 78.) (Notice, this was before His ascension.)

Q. Was our Lord very careful to teach His disciples that He had a true and REAL BODY after He rose?

A. Yes; He told them to behold His hands and feet with the marks of the nails still in them.

Q. What did He say besides?

A. "Handle Me, and see; for a spirit hath not FLESH AND BONES AS YE SEE ME HAVE."

Q. Was His body changed from what it was BEFORE HE DIED?

A. Yes; it became a spiritual body. (That is, it became a spiritual body before His ascension.)

Q. What is that?

A. A body that can move and act as a spirit does. (Page 79.)

Here is their description of our Lord's spiritual body, a body that "hath flesh and bones," that is, the body He had after His resurrection, but which they teach was "changed from what it was before HE DIED," into what it was AFTER HIS RESURRECTION, AND BEFORE HIS ASCENSION, and thus the body of "flesh and bones" He had during the forty days, during which He was on earth, after His resurrection and before His ascension, a "spiritual body" in their teaching, yet a body of "flesh and bones," and which took natural food, for He ate with His disciples.

Now they teach that this IDENTICAL "BODY OF FLESH AND BONES" which Christ had AFTER HIS RESURRECTION, and BEFORE HIS ASCENSION, is ACTUALLY and REALLY PRESENT IN THE BREAD AND WINE, though they try to cover their Romish doctrine of the Real Presence by saying "this body of flesh and bones is Christ's spiritual body."

Now let it be constantly borne in mind that they teach that the body of "flesh and bones" which they declare above, is the SPIRITUAL BODY of Christ, *is actually present in the bread and wine,* and is "GIVEN, TAKEN and RECEIVED" in the bread and wine. Then let none be deceived by the foolish trick they attempt, when they talk about "in a spiritual or heavenly manner," for they believe and declare it is the "body

of flesh and bones" which is the "spiritual body," and affirm that it was a spiritual body, though having flesh and bones, because Christ could "pass through closed doors, appear and vanish at will," forgetting that before our Lord's death he miraculously passed through, not merely a door, but a living, thronging multitude, unseen. They also forget when they teach that Christ's "spiritual, or heavenly body" has flesh and blood, that the apostle distinctly affirms of the resurrection body, that *flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.* Read 1 Cor. xv. 50-52.

But we will now proceed to their teaching about the Real Presence of this *spiritual body of flesh and bones being actually in the* bread and wine, and being "*given, taken,* and *received*" in the Lord's Supper.

Q. If our Blessed Lord, who is the Truth, and whose words are spirit and life, gave men the outward part as His body and blood, can there be any doubt about our receiving them?

A. No. The BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST must be TAKEN and RECEIVED by the faithful in our Lord's Supper.

Q. After what manner is the body and blood of Christ so present as to be given, taken, and eaten in the Lord's Supper?

A. "Spiritually," or in a heavenly and spiritual manner.

Pause here a moment. Do not be deceived by this answer in which the terms "spiritually, or in a heavenly manner" are used, for I have shown you they do not use these terms in their usual and common-sense

manner. They teach that the body of flesh and blood, or as our Lord put it, "flesh and bones," which He had BEFORE He went to heaven, WAS HIS SPIRITUAL body, and that it is actually present in the bread and wine; whereas it was not a spiritual body at all, but a body of "flesh and bones," and therefore a body composed of matter, hence it could not be in the bread and wine, for two bodies of matter cannot occupy the same space at the same time, unless we admit that the High Church priest who consecrates the elements has the power to perform a miracle whenever he wishes. It did not become a spiritual body till He ascended into the heavens. One would need a High Church dictionary to understand the unauthorized meaning they attach to words. But we will proceed with their Manual.

Q. Does "spiritually" mean UNREALLY or figuratively?

A. No. Our Lord was present with His disciples most REALLY IN FLESH AND BLOOD after He rose from the dead (Luke xxiv. 39), although His presence was after an HEAVENLY OR SPIRITUAL MANNER, so that His body could pass through closed doors and "appear" and "vanish" at will. (John xx. 19; Luke xxiv. 31, p. 252.)

Here they affirm that matter, flesh and bones, are present in the manner in which spirit manifests its presence, which is an attempt to mystify by talking of an impossibility.

But the statement is that it is NOT in an UNREAL manner that what they call the "spiritual body of

Christ," which "*had flesh and bones*" is present, but as He was most really present with His disciples in flesh and blood, though in what they call His spiritual body, so He in the same spiritual body of flesh and bones, which terms are self-contradictory, or flesh and blood, as they put it in another place, is MOST REALLY present in the bread and wine; in other words, the bread is really the flesh of the body which Christ had after His resurrection, and before His ascension, and the wine is as really, and not figuratively, the actual blood of that body.

Again another question and answer.

Q. Is the presence a presence only in the heart of the receiver?

A. No. The BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST are "GIVEN," as well as "TAKEN and EATEN," etc. (P. 253.)

It is made clear that they do not mean that it is only in a "spiritual manner" that Christ is received in the believer's heart; but that the flesh and blood of the body which he had during the forty days after His resurrection, which Christ Himself said had "flesh and bones" is not UNREALLY in the bread and wine, but ACTUALLY there, and they try to cover the enormity of their teaching by the self-contradictory assertion that, the body of "flesh and bones" was our Lord's spiritual or heavenly body.

Here is a foolish and contradictory form of an anti-Scriptural and Romish doctrine, viz., that the body of Christ, flesh and blood, is *actually* and *really* in the elements at the Lord's Supper, *and this is taught by the High Church.*

While High Churchmen thus boldly teach the Real Presence of Christ in the bread and wine, I wish to call attention to the words of their great divine, whom they are proud to call "the judicious Hooker." In his "Fifth Book of Ecclesiastical Polity," page 307, edition of 1705, I find these words: "I see NOT in which way it should be gathered from the words of Christ, when and where, the bread is His body, or the cup is His blood; BUT ONLY IN THE HEART AND SOUL OF HIM WHICH RECEIVETH THEM."

The reader will please notice that their own "JUDICIOUS HOOKER" HERE DIRECTLY CONTRADICTS the teaching of this High Church Manual, which, on page 253, asks the question, "Is the presence, a presence ONLY IN THE HEART OF THE RECEIVER?" and then answers in these words, "No; THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST ARE 'GIVEN,' AS WELL AS 'TAKEN AND EATEN.'" Whereas Hooker, and all true Protestants say, "Christ is present *only in the heart and soul* of him which receiveth them."

TRULY, HIGH CHURCHISM IS ROMANISM.

This effort of the High Church party to import Romish practices into the Protestant Church of England is not simply of recent date.

In Strype's History of the Reformation, published in 1709, chapter 13, page 175, I find proof of the same desire. Strype says: "And the first bishops that were made, and who were but newly returned from their exiles, as Cox, Grindall, Horne, Sandys, Jewell, Parkhurst, Bentham, upon their first returns, before they entered upon their ministry, labored all they

could against receiving into the Church the PAPISTICAL HABITS, and that all the ceremonies should be clean laid aside. But they could not obtain it from the QUEEN AND PARLIAMENT, AND THE HABITS WERE ENACTED."

So, to-day, the successors of that same Papistical party strive to introduce "PAPISTICAL HABITS," in proof of which I will give a few extracts from another High Church Catechism taught in the High Church Sunday-schools, and from these samples we can judge of the Romanizing tendency of their teaching.

The questions and answers I submit, are in "Gace's Catechism, for the use of Families and Parochial Schools."

Give a brief summary of the Church Catechism.

A. Into this Church I was admitted by baptism, and then received God's Holy Spirit within me, BEING THEREBY REGENERATED, that is to say, BORN AGAIN. Made one with Christ, and so the child of God; and if, by God's grace, I continue in this state of salvation, I shall be finally numbered with the elect, as I am visibly so at present. To preserve this grace in me, the Saviour of the world appointed the sacrament of the most blessed Body and Blood, to be the spiritual food and sustenance of the faithful, and His Church the instrument of conveying it to me. That this Church is one, and that in this country of England, *no other exists save the Anglican Church*, etc.

Q. In what light are we to consider dissenters?

A. AS HERETICS.

Q. And how are we to regard Roman Catholics?

A. These are in different case from Protestant

Dissenters. THE ROMISH CHURCH IS A TRUE BRANCH OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Q. What is the Catholic Church?

A. That visible society of faithful men all over the world which is called by the name of Christ. (Quoted in *Undeceived*, pp. 112 and 113.)

Here is High Churchism in a nutshell.

They teach their Sunday-school scholars and their children in their families that ALL DISSENTERS ARE HERETICS, but that the Roman Church is a true branch of that visible society of faithful men in all the world which is called by the name of Christ.

But to continue this Catechism:

Q. Can anyone become a Christian without baptism?

A. "No," etc.

Q. When do we receive forgiveness of sins?

A. When we are baptized.

Q. What are the sins hereby forgiven?

A. Original and actual.

Q. What is actual sin?

A. Any sin we ourselves actually commit.

Q. Does baptism entirely cleanse us from these?

A. Yes, it places us in a state as though we had never committed them.

Here is taught this fatal error, not to mention minor ones, that we receive forgiveness of sins by baptism.

No wonder that the astute Papist, Cardinal Newman, said, "Surely we ought, in comparison with other sects, to give our countenance to the Anglican Church. *They are our natural, though it may be our covert*

allies." (See *Difficulties of Anglicans*, vol. i., pp. 2 and 3.)

I submit the following extracts from the book called "John Wesley in company with High Churchmen," in which the writer states the tenets of the High Church party, and, strangely enough, tries to prove that they are in harmony with Wesley's teaching. I will not notice his unblushing perversions of Wesley's words in his vain attempt, but simply quote his words which, are in turn evidently quotations from other High Church authorities. He says: "Of Penance. Repentance like every other grace has of necessity an inward power and an outward form. These two are scripturally expressed in prayer-book language by Penitence and Penance. . . . Without acts of Penance, Penitence is dead, being alone. The right to impose Penance flows naturally from the relation which the Church bears to the offender. . . The spiritual necessities of the individual, and the well-being of the Church alike bear witness that the imposition of Penance is a very useful part of ecclesiastical discipline." (P. 50.)

On the same page he says, referring to priestly absolution:—

"God uses the ministry of man for the remission of sins in Baptism, and He has equally promised remission of sins by the ministry of man in Absolution."

Confession in secret to a priest he advocates earnestly, on page 46, and says of it, "Touching this, the Church has always held that what a Priest hears under the seal of the confession, he hears only as a

minister of the Gospel; and that the highest sacrilege would be committed by discovering it to men."

The benefits, glory and duty of celibacy are not forgotten by this High Churchman.

He says, "Blessed, blessed of the Lord are they (called by whatever name), who abjure things lawful in themselves, and for the kingdom of heaven's sake, forsake home, house, and lands in order to be without carefulness for the things of this world, and to be more devoted to their Lord in the service of His Church, and poor, and to be holy both in body and soul, great is their reward now, in this life, and in the world to come. Not all can receive this saying, but he that is able, let him receive it. Specially true is this of those called to the priestly office, 'No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life.'"

> "A virgin priest the altar best attends,
> Our Lord that state commands not, yet commends."

"In nothing, perhaps, are Protestant ideas more directly at variance with God's Word and will, than in this article," etc. But it is not only celibacy for the *Priests*, that Anglicans urge, for this author says, "A woman may leave a widowed mother to marry a godless man, and this world approves; 'Marriage is woman's vocation,' no tongue is raised against it. But for one who in obedience to a higher call leaves the house of her father where she may save a housekeeper's wages to follow a holy spiritual vocation there are no reproaches too bitter." (See pp. 64 and 65.)

Among the fast days we find the following, "The

Evens or Vigils before certain festivals of our Blessed Lord, of His virgin mother, and of His saints; a table of which is given." (P. 72.)

On page 74 the author declares, "The instrumental means of our justification are the sacraments by which God *ordinarily conveys it.*"

In chapter xiii. where he treats of Prayers for the Dead, we find it beginning thus: "Prayer for the faithful departed is rooted in the fact that we are members of a community deathless, indissoluble and laboring under imperfections, in different degrees, in all its parts. No special need, therefore, for express texts authorizing us to do that which, if we pray at all, we cannot fail to do, who, subjects of grace, cannot forego praying to God to hasten that work of grace, which having begun, He is completing in all, and therefore in the departed, till the 'day of Christ.' We cannot even say the Lord's Prayer without using a petition for the faithful departed. 'Thy kingdom come,' an event which manifestly concerns them as much as it does us; since on that they wait for the perfecting of their bliss and the redemption of the body. . . God's people under both dispensations have, with one consent, continued in prayers for the dead." (See p. 84.)

I shall now furnish evidence of another but equally forcible character to make good my charge that High Churchism is essentially Romanism.

Read the following from the Romish Cardinal Manning, once a High Church clergyman:

"In the last thirty years, *i.e.*, since 1837, there has

sprung up in the Anglican establishment an extensive rejection of Protestantism, and a sincere desire and claim to be Catholic. . . . Protestantism is recognized as a thing intrinsically untenable, and irreconcilable with the (Roman) Catholic Faith. The school of which I speak claim to be Catholic because they reject Protestantism with all its heterodoxies. . . . At this time the doctrine of the sacraments, their nature, number, and graces; the intercession and invocation of the saints; the power of the priesthood in sacrifice and absolution; the excellence and obligation of the religious life; are all held and taught by clergymen of the Church of England. . . . Add to this the practice of confession, and the works of temporal and spiritual mercy, in form and rule borrowed from the (Roman) Catholic Church, all are to be found among those who are still within the Anglican communion. I must also add the latest and strangest phenomenon of this movement—the adoption of an elaborate ritual, with its vestments, borrowed from the (Roman) Catholic Church. . . . The multitude worshipping in churches which might almost be mistaken for ours . . . is very great. They are coming up to the very threshold of the (Roman) Catholic Church. They have learned to lean upon it as the centre of Christendom, from which they sprang, and upon which their own Church is supposed to rest. They use our devotions, our books, our pictures of piety." (*Essays on Religion*, by Archbishop Manning, second series, pp. 12-14, quoted by Lord Robert Montagu, in *Recent Events and a Clue to their Solution*, p. 12.)

Such language as the above, coming from such an authority as Cardinal Manning, and corresponding so perfectly with facts known to the reading public, prove conclusively that HIGH CHURCHISM IS ROMANISM.

Archbishop Sumner truly said of the Puseyites, or High Churchmen of his day: "They have gone on from one Romish practice, and one Romish tenet to another, UNTIL ALL THAT IS DISTINCTIVE OF PROTESTANT DOCTRINE AND PROTESTANT WORSHIP HAS WELL NIGH DISAPPEARED." (Quoted by Lord Robert Montagu, p. 66.)

The late Rev. Dr. Fraser, Bishop of Manchester, says: "There exists among us an extreme party, the Ritualists, which entertain opinions on the communion, the Invocation of the Holy Virgin and saints, and absolution, WHICH IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO DISTINGUISH FROM THE DOCTRINES PROFESSED BY THE CHURCH OF ROME." Then Bishop Fraser continues, "I cannot give my approval to such doctrines; and when I turn to the principles of the Prayer Book, I foresee for the Church of England, a period of troubles in the near present; while, for the future, which is very menacing, and very near, I foresee a series of disaster and ultimate destruction." (Montagu, pp. 68, 69.)

When a bishop in the Church of England sounds the alarm in such earnest language it is full time for the Protestants in every parish to ask, Is this High Church malarial poison breathed by my children in their Sunday School teaching? Is it insiduously taught by my minister? And they should not allow any veneration for their spiritual guides to hinder an

honest and searching investigation. Their loyalty to true Protestant teaching and to God demands it.

Again on page 69: "The new Bishop of Lincoln, whom Mr. Gladstone appointed last year, 1885, has affirmed the doctrine of transubstantiation; has advocated a visible communion between the Church of England and the Church of Rome; and in the Communicants' Manual has recommended a number of Romish works as suitable for meditation and devotion. He also insists on confession and absolution as a substantial part of elementary instruction; and teaches the practice of praying for the dead."

One extract from the Communicants' Manual will suffice: "The consecration is . . . . the central act of the service by which THE BREAD AND WINE ARE MADE . . . . VERILY AND INDEED THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST AND ARE OFFERED TO GOD THE FATHER AS THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE." (*Recent Events and a Clue to their Solution*, pp. 69, 70.) This is the teaching of the bishop of the Church of England who published the Communicants' Manual, which is now in use as a book of religious instruction.

Again I quote from *The Churchman Armed*, pp. 63 and 64. The sermon is by the Rev. Dr. Miller, of Lincoln College, Oxford. He laments the strong Romish tendencies which are gaining ground in the Episcopalian body.

"What, we ask, is our Church? What right has the Church of England to her present position, unless it be that she is distinctively a Reformed and Protestant Church? We have no honest standing in the

country if our Church is not distinctly Reformed and Protestant. The common sense and the moral sense of the people of England will see, and has seen this, that, however much you may quibble upon an expression here and there in the Prayer Book, it is a monstrous demand upon the credulity of the Church and nation to make believe that, after all, a man may remain among us with integrity before God and man, while the whole of his ministrations are devoted to BRIDGING OVER THE CHASM BETWEEN US AND ROME, and to accustoming the people to the creed and worship of that Church, which the Church of England has pronounced to be idolatrous. Your Church in her Prayer Book has distinctly put the brand of idolatry on the forehead of the Church of Rome. . . . . It is for this reason that we stand amongst you to protest that the Church of England knows nothing of much that is being introduced in some places. Altars! What does the Church of England know of altars? Show me the passage in which the Lord's Table is called an 'altar.' There is not such a solitary place, —not a rubric, not a prayer,—in the whole Prayer Book in which it is so designated. We are prepared to show you by no deep research, but by simply taking down a volume which is probably on the shelves of every clergyman in Ipswich, that this is not a matter of chance; but that obviously on deliberation and of set purposes and design, that word was gradually eliminated from the Prayer Book, and the Romish altar became the honest communion table of the Church of England. Again, we ask, show us any passage in the

New Testament in which the minister of God is called by the Greek term for a sacrificing priest. THERE IS NOT ONE SOLITARY PASSAGE IN THE RANGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN WHICH THE MINISTER IS THUS DESIGNATED. . . . It seems somewhat strange that the present crisis should be chosen in England to reconcile the minds of the people to that which is Romish. . . . This is the Church of Rome into which the people of England are to be gradually led! Some through the door of æsthetics. Such beautiful music! Such gorgeous architecture! Such exquisite churches! Such striking processions! Brethren . . . be on your guard. Remember that, through an undue devotion to these things, and as if caught on the hook baited by these things, many a poor victim has gone over to the Church of Rome. Be on your guard and recollect that, wherever the mind is gradually attaching undue importance to ceremonials and externals, it is proportionably declining and decaying in that which is spiritual."

I cannot present all the Romish tenets which the High Church faction is endeavoring to introduce into the Protestant Church of England, but I will refer the curious reader to the book entitled, *Audi Alteram Partem, or, High Church,* by a clergyman of the Episcopal Body in England, the Rev. Hely A. Smith, who shows that High Church teaching includes Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence, Auricular Confession and Priestly Absolution, the Celibacy of the Clergy, Prayers for the Dead and Purgatory.

The author makes the following quotations from a book called *The Church, and Liberties of England,*

by Nevison Loraine, pp. 56 and 57. "Celibacy beyond the limits of the priesthood is urged in *Three Vows*, by Rev. W. Humphrey. It is said: 'perpetual continence is requisite in order to religion.' The *Church News* is 'perfectly convinced,' it says: 'of the desirability of the celibate life for men'—but when the men are celibate who will marry the women? So it is celibacy all round that this organ urges as largely desirable for the Christian Church. The quotation (April 7, 1869) is,—'We are perfectly convinced that until the celibate life, especially for Priests, is very widely recognized and practised among us, we should be lacking in an important feature necessary to the perfection of the Christian Church. Therefore the hope of the perfection of the Christian Church increases with the diminution of the human race, and I suppose, fulfilled by its extinction."

This is what High Churchism is, when full blown. They begin by teaching the doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration and Apostolic Succession, and by them prepare the way for Confession, Absolution, Prayers for the dead and Celibacy, which is contrary to the Divine Law, and has been productive of more impurity and misery than time can reveal.

Truly HIGH CHURCHISM IS ROMANISM.

Much more might be added, if necessary, to prove that High Churchism is Romanism, and that Cardinal Newman was correct when he said of High Churchmen, in their relation to the Papal Church, "They are her natural, though it may be her covert, allies, they are faithful nurses and conservators of her spirit." (*Difficulties of Anglicans*, vol. i, p. 6.)

Were it not for the Protestantism of the Evangelicals, the High Church party would soon make peace with Rome, and bow their willing necks to her servile yoke, but it would be a peace as devoid of honor, in the present, as it would be despoiled of hope for the future.

Effects of the False Teaching of High Churchism.

Some young person may ask what evils follow the teaching of these High Church doctrines?

To fully and explicitly answer this important question would require more space than I can devote to it, but I will briefly indicate some of the serious and even fatal results which follow what is called Sacramentarian teaching, which is the theory of the High Church faction, and of the Romanist.

Sacramentarian teaching means that the salvation of the soul is to be obtained through receiving the sacraments of the Church, and destroys the simple and Gospel plan of a personal faith IN CHRIST ALONE as He is offered to us in the Gospel. Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence, Apostolic Succession, etc., etc., are parts of the Sacramentarian theory.

They all lead to a trust in the *ceremonials* of religious worship, and foster and develop a trust in the *form of worship*, and hinder, in a vast majority of cases, that true spiritual worship through a personal faith in Christ which the Gospel requires as essential to salvation.

The full effects of this sacramentarian, or ritualistic form of worship may be seen in the Roman Catholic Church. Any one who has had an extensive and intimate acquaintance with the members of that Church, will have discovered that a vast majority rest in the ceremonial observances of their Church for salvation, while comparatively few obtain the conception of receiving salvation simply as the outcome of a godly sorrow for sin, followed by a CONSCIOUS, PERSONAL TRUST IN CHRIST; in other words, the sacramentarian theory, whether taught by Roman Catholics or High Churchmen, exalts unto undue importance the FORMS of worship, or the sacraments, and obscures the Gospel doctrine of justification by faith, so fully and clearly expressed in Scripture as the God-appointed means of salvation.

"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved" is the burden of the Gospel message; but the High Church party cry out, "RECEIVE THE SACRAMENTS OF THE CHURCH AND YOU SHALL BE SAVED."

Christ says, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God," and then tells how to obtain this new life which is the new birth, when He says, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life;" but the High Church party says, you were "born again when you were baptized," for this is their doctrine of baptismal regeneration, as I have shown above. Do not think, however, that all the members of the Church of England believe that doctrine, for I have shown it is the High Church party in the Episcopal body, who hold it, and that the Pro-

testants in that Church absolutely deny it as unscriptural and dangerous.

The exposition of this one doctrine must suffice for the present, but much more might be brought forward to prove that these teachings fatally obscure the plan of salvation as laid down in the Gospel, and tend to destroy precious souls for whom Christ died.

If the Protestantism of to-day in the Church of England is a worthy successor of the Protestantism of the past, it will rise in its might and shake off this deadly incubus of High Churchism, alias Romanism.

CHAPTER X.

Is the Episcopal Form of Church Government Prescribed in Scripture? Is it the only Valid Form for a Christian Church?

THE High Church claim is, that the Episcopal form of Church Government is prescribed in the Word of God as the only valid form for the organization of the Church on earth.

We are told with marvellous complacency that, "Episcopacy is necessary because it is of Divine institution, and because the Church of God has been governed in that way for upwards of three thousand years." (See *Methodism* vs. *The Church*, p. 24.)

This they evidently consider an axiomatic truth, hence, in their opinion, it is necessary simply to state it, and it will find immediate acceptance.

It may be that after an examination of the proofs upon which this assertion rests, it will be not only regarded as unsusceptible of proof, but also extremely improbable, and still more, positively contradictory to the testimony of the Scriptures and history.

Let us examine the new Church organization as shown in the New Testament, and as understood by the early Fathers and the vast majority of the Protestant churches of to-day.

1st. The New Testament. Does it establish beyond a doubt the necessity of three orders, for if such were necessary, no one who believes in the Divine revelation will suppose for one moment that it would be left a matter of doubt ?

In Acts 20th chapter, the 17th to the 28th verses, we have an example of the use of the terms presbyter and bishop, as applied to the same persons. In the 17th verse, Paul called to him the elders, the "presbuterous" of the congregation, and addresses them as elders; then in the 28th verse, still speaking *to the same persons*, he says: "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you 'episcopous,'" translated in the old version, the critical English New Testament, and Wesley's Testament, "*overseers*," but in the Revised Version and in the translation by Dr. Alford, Dean of Canterbury, "bishops."

On the word "presbuterous" Dean Alford, in his Greek Testament, makes this comment: "Presbuterous is called in verse 28th episcopous. This circumstance began very early to contradict the growing views of the apostolic institution and necessity of prelatical episcopacy. Thus Irenæus iii, 14, 2, page 201, 'In Miletus having called together the bishops and elders who were at Ephesus and from the adjoining cities.' Here we see (1) the two, the bishops and presbyters distinguished, as if both were sent for, in order that the titles might not seem to belong to the same persons, and (2) other neighboring churches brought in, in order that there might not seem to be episcopoi,

(bishops) in one church only. That neither of these was the case is clearly shown by the plain words of this verse, 'He sent to Ephesus and *summoned the elders of the church.*' So early did interested and disingenuous interpretations begin to cloud the light which the Scriptures might have thrown on ecclesiastical questions. The English version has hardly dealt fairly in this case with the sacred text in rendering episcopous, verse 28, *overseers*, whereas it ought there as in all other places, to have been *bishops*, that the fact of *elders* and *bishops* having been *originally* and *apostolically synonymous* might be apparent to the ordinary English reader, which now it is not."

The italics are Dean Alford's own, and are designed to give emphasis and call attention particularly to such portions. He here shows conclusively that the position of High Churchmen, that elders and bishops were different orders, is false. The elders and bishops at that time were one order according to Dean Alford, and he is correct.

Again in Titus i. 5–7: "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain *elders* in every city, as I had appointed thee. If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot or unruly. For a *bishop* must be blameless, as the steward of God." Here again the terms elder and bishop are applied to the one person. No difference then between a presbyter and elder, and a bishop.

But how did the early Fathers write of elders and presbyters?

Clemens Romanus says: "In the country and cities where the apostles preached, they ordained their first converts for *bishops* and *deacons* over those who should believe." And again he writes: "The apostle foreknew through our Lord Jesus Christ that contention would arise about the word *episcopacy*, and therefore being endued with a perfect knowledge appointed the aforesaid officers, viz., *bishops* and *deacons*, and left the manner of their succession described, so that when they died, other approved men might succeed them and perform their office."

Only two orders mentioned by Clemens Romanus, even when describing the method of governing the Church.

But I close this part by a quotation from Stillingfleet, where he is explaining a passage from Jerome on this subject, which had been perverted by some commentators. Stillingfleet says of Jerome: "Is it imaginable that a man who had been proving all along the superiority of a *presbyter* above a *deacon* because of his *identity with a bishop in the apostles' times*, should at the same time say a bishop was above a presbyter by the apostles' institution, and thus so directly overthrow all he had been saying before?"

Thus, in the Scripture the words meant the same thing, and the early fathers above quoted understood them to mean only *one* order.

Now, we turn to the *powers exercised* by bishops and presbyters, and in this line of search we will find convincing proof that the two terms designated but one and the same order.

Let us read the account given of the ordination of Barnabas and Saul, and see how many of the apostles were there, as according to High Churchmen they, as the bishops, only had power to ordain. It is found in the thirteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and not a word about *apostles* being present, which would certainly have been mentioned had they been there.

Acts xiii. 1–3: "Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away."

Not a word about apostles being present, for there was not one of them there; but it says, "prophets and teachers," and mentions the principal ones among them.

High Churchmen have tried to break the force of this Scripture, which destroys their theory, by saying, "It was not an ordination;" I reply, it is the only ecclesiastical ordination of Barnabas and Saul of which we have any account, and it is futile to dispute it. It was a separation of them to the work to which the Holy Spirit had called them, viz., the ministry of the word, and it was done by the presbytery, and by the laying on of hands, and prayer. Can any proof be

asked clearer than this, that the power of ordination was in the presbytery?

Wesley is quoted, to prove that it was not an ordination; but a careful reading will show that he wished to present the *real source of Paul's authority* to preach, viz.: that it came from the Divine call, and that the *Divine call* was the *true*, and *only essential* ordination to the work of the ministry, which is the view of Luther also.

Look at Wesley's words carefully: "This was not ordaining them," by which he evidently means, "this was not the source of their authority to do the work upon which they were about to enter."

"St. Paul was ordained long before, and that not of man, neither by men." It is perfectly clear that Wesley refers to the *original and essential source* from which Paul derived his authority, and ascribes it *exclusively* to the *call to the ministry*, which came from *God*, and not from *men*, and he wished to show the absolute necessity for a Divine call antecedent to human ordination.

But, while Paul based his authority to preach solely upon the Divine call, he still accepted the usual sanction of the Church, for Wesley says in the same note, "It was only *inducting* him to the province for which our Lord had appointed him from the beginning, and which was now revealed to the prophets and teachers." So we are perfectly consistent in saying that this was the ordination of *Paul by the Church*, for according to Wesley, it was the *human or churchly induction of Paul to the work*, "to which" the Holy Spirit said,

"I have called him." It was not the Divine call, or *authority* to the apostolic office, but *it was the Church's public acknowledgment of the claim made by Paul and Barnabas that God had called them to this work, and was the Church's appointment or ordination* to the work to which they were called, viz.: Paul, called of God, to the work of an apostle, and Barnabas, called by the Spirit, to the work of preaching the Gospel. But Barnabas was not called of God, nor appointed by the Church to the work of an apostle, but as a preacher, in the office of presbyter, and he here receives the Church's authorization for that office, as Paul receives it to the apostolic office, to which he was already called of God, and they both received their ecclesiastical authority from the hands of presbyters.

But was this actually Paul's ordination by the Church. Dean Alford in speaking of it says: "This was a new fasting and special prayer for Barnabas and Saul. Fasting and prayer have ever been connected with the solemn *times of ordination* by the Christian Church." He believes it was "*a solemn time of ordination.*" See Lange on this passage, as follows:

"The apostolate of Paul, strictly speaking, begins on the occasion of this mission,—he is now first sent forth. . . . Saul too was called by Jesus Christ. . . . but it is only at this comparatively late period, after sufficient time had been afforded for his internal growth, and his progress in the Divine life . . . that he is actually sent, and enters upon his glorious career as the apostle of the Gentiles. It is the Holy Ghost who calls him to his great work, but men are the agents of

the Holy Ghost. It is some one of the Christian prophets in Antioch, through whose mouth the Holy Spirit says that Barnabas and Saul should be separated for the work, and it is the Church that receives this command . . . *and dedicates the two men to their work by the imposition of hands* and then sends them forth."

In Poole's Commentary we find in regard to this act performed by the prophets and teachers upon Paul. 2nd. "*The approbation of the Church to the Heavenly call they had.*" What is this but ordination?

See also Burkitt's Commentary: Note 2. "*Separate me Paul and Barnabas.*" Here note first: "That the work of the ministry is a separate work. Ministers must be set apart for the work of the ministry before they undertake it. Second, a call from God is not sufficient without a separation by men. Third, that this separation ought to be performed by the chief ministers of the Church who have authority from Christ to separate and set others apart for the work of the ministry.

Note 3. That this solemn act and ordinance ought to be performed in a very solemn manner by fasting and prayer and by the imposition of hands."

It is perfectly clear that Burkitt also, who was high authority in the Episcopalian Church, holds that Paul was then ordained.

See also Jamieson, Faussett and Brown on the same passage. "Sent them away with the double call of the *Spirit first, and next of the Church.* So clothed their mission is thus described. They being sent forth

by the Holy Ghost. Have we not here for all time the *true principle of appointment to sacred office.*"

This is another standard authority in favor of the position that Paul was then ordained.

I will add but one more testimony to those already given to prove that Paul was ordained by others than apostles, and that the ceremony in Acts, 13th chapter, was his ordination to the work of the ministry.

See *Pulpit Commentary.* Rev. Canon H. D. M. Spence, M.A., vol. Acts, Exposition by the Right Hon. and Rev. A. C. Hervey, D.D., Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells, on Acts, 13th chapter, 3rd verse: "Doubtless on receiving this intimation of the Spirit they fixed a day for the ORDINATION and prepared for it by fasting and prayer."

But I need not multiply proofs by quoting from the most learned divines even in the Church of England, thus taking witnesses out of the ranks of our opponents, for what I have given already abundantly establishes my position, that Paul was then ordained, and that it was done by presbyters.

I have given quotations from leading divines to prove that the simple plain statement of the Scripture is undoubtedly to be taken just as it reads, and that Paul was *then ordained by men who were not apostles.*

It is clear, therefore, that Paul's ordination was performed by men who were neither apostles nor bishops in the High Church sense, hence it was a presbyterial ordination, and totally destroys the fiction of an episcopacy in High Church form in apostolic times.

Again, Paul says to Timothy in 1st Timothy iv. 14:

"Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of hands of the *presbytery.*" Here the power of ordination is said by Paul to be exercised by the presbytery. Paul said in the second epistle to Timothy: "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." Paul probably presided at the meeting of the presbytery, and joined with the *presbyters* when the ceremony of "*the laying on of the hands of the presbytery*" *was performed.*

Then it is clear from Scripture that the power to ordain rested in, and was exercised by, *presbyters.* There is no place for three orders yet, nor are they found here.

Let us now examine the evidence the early Fathers give of the exercise of the power of ordination by the elders. Having established that presbyters, or elders, and bishops, were one order by the Scripture, it is not necessary to adduce any proof from the Fathers, but as High Churchmen claim that the "Church was before the Scriptures" and "formed the Scriptures," to satisfy such as hold this view, I will give the evidence of some of the Fathers to prove that presbyters, as such, did ordain others presbyters, and appointed some to the office of "overseer" or "bishop."

Firmillian says: "All power and grace is constituted in the Church, where *seniors* preside who have the power of baptizing, confirming, and *ordaining.*" And Tertullian defines what is meant by *seniors.* He says: "In the ecclesiastical courts *approved elders preside.*"

Elders had, and exercised, the power of ordaining at that date.

Moshiem's Testimony.

Moshiem says: "Neither Christ Himself nor His holy apostles have commanded anything clearly, or expressly, concerning the external form of the Church, and the precise method according to which it should be governed. (See part ii. p. 85.) Again he says, on p. 88, part ii.: "The rulers of the Church were called either *presbyters or bishops*, which two titles are in the New Testament *undoubtedly applied to the same order of men.*"

Hear Archbishop Cranmer's reply to the question, "Whether bishops or priests were made first? and if the priests first, then the priests made the bishops." Cranmer answered: "The bishops and priests were at *one time*, and were not two things; but both one in office at the beginning of Christ's kingdom."

I will quote from Wesley, and show his opinions on this question.

Wesley's View.

"As to my own judgment, I still believe the episcopal form of Church government to be Scriptural and apostolical. I mean well agreeing with the practice and writings of the apostles, but that it is prescribed in Scripture I do not believe. This opinion, which I once zealously espoused, I have been heartily ashamed of ever since I read Bishop Stillingfleet's *Irenicum*. I think he has unanswerably proved that neither Christ nor His apostles prescribe any particular form

of Church government, and that the plea for the *diocesan episcopacy was never heard of in the primitive Church.*"

Bishop Lightfoot says: "At the close of the apostolic age the two lower orders of the threefold ministry were firmly and widely established; *but traces of the third and highest order, the episcopate properly so called, are few and indistinct.*" (See *Fernly Lecture,* 1885, p. 3, quoted from *Lightfoot,* Phil., p. 193).

Lightfoot is a favorite authority with High Churchmen, who quote him to prove this doctrine, but he adds a strong, though it may be unwilling, testimony to its falsity, by admitting that even "traces of it at the close of the apostolic age are few and indistinct." Here Bishop Lightfoot admits that at the very time when, if there had been such a thing as episcopacy, the proofs would have been plain and perfectly convincing, no proof can be found, and that even the "*traces of a third order are few and indistinct.*" Is it possible to conceive that if episcopacy was an essential part of the Divine plan for the ministry of the Word, that God would have esteemed it so lightly, that He would have allowed it to become so perfectly obscured that a profound scholar like Bishop Lightfoot, would not be able to find *one* clear and positive proof of its existence, nor even *one distinct trace of it*? and this, at the very time in the history of the Church when positive proof would have been found, if such order had an existence. It is simply inconceivable that it should be so. And again, why should "*the two lower orders be firmly and widely established,*" and the "highest," and confes-

sedly most important one, have *not one clearly attested credential*, and only "*few and indistinct traces.*"

It affords presumptive evidence, amounting to a moral certainty, that episcopacy is not a Divine institution, and therefore not necessary to a true Christian Church.

For a spirited description of the rise and development of the episcopacy, which is too lengthy to insert here, I refer the reader to *Coleman's Apostolic and Primitive Church*, chapters, vii. to x., inclusive. I will give but one of the author's quotations, to show the nature of the institution at an early date. He quotes from Jerome A.D. 400, lib. 2, in Ezech, c. 4, vol. iii. p. 943 as follows: "The bishops by their pride and base deeds are a reproach to their name. In the place of humility they manifest pride, as though they had acquired honor, and not disgrace; and whenever they perceive one to have gained an influence by rightly handling the Word of God they seek by destruction to oppose him." (See p. 304.)

But to return to the question, whether in the early Church the words bishops and presbyter were applied to the same persons, and the same order, thus proving there were not three orders in the ministry, we now quote from a remarkable manuscript called the *Didache*, or the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, which was discovered in the year 1873 in the library of the Jerusalem Monastery of the Most Holy Sepulchre, in Constantinople.

For brevity's sake I will quote but one of the testimonies which prove that bishop and presbyter were

used to describe the same order in the ministry, and that, therefore, the ordinations performed by presbyters are scripturally valid. In this manuscript it is said: "Elect therefore for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord," etc. (Chap. xv. 1.)

Commenting on this verse, Dr. Philip Schaff, says: "The local churches, or individual congregations, are ruled by bishops, or deacons elected, or appointed by the people." Dr. Schaff also remarks: "The bishops of the Didache (another name for 'The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles') are identical with the presbyters, hence the latter are not mentioned at all." (See *Didache*, p. 73). So also Bishop Lightfoot wrote regarding this same thing: "When our author wrote, bishop still remained a synonym for presbyter, and the episcopal office properly so-called had not been constituted in the district in which he lived." (See *Didache*, p. 74, foot note.)

We turn to the work of the Rev. John Stoughton, D.D., and in his *Primitive Ecclesia*, we find these words: "He (Paul) described to Timothy what a bishop should be, evidently meaning by a bishop the *same officer he subsequently called an elder.*" (*Ecclesia*, p. 10.)

Again on page 11: "Officers of the latter kind whom they ordained are called elders or overseers, *presbyters or bishops, words used interchangeably,* about which there has been much controversy. *These words have acquired in the course of time technical significations* pointing to what are styled two orders, *but that no such technical distinction exists in the*

New Testament, distinguished Episcopalian scholars are prepared to admit. . . . We may then at once set the distinction aside," etc.

Rev. J. Radford Thompson on "The Orders," (see *Ecclesia*, p. 62): "In Apostolic times, however, *two orders of officers were universal.* First in point of time came deacons. . . Then came the presbyters, or bishops," etc.

Referring to what he styles the "genuine First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians," the writer says: "There is no trace at all of the subsequent distinction between the bishop and the presbyter; as in the New Testament these terms are used convertibly to designate the same officer," and refers to 1 Epis. Clem., chap xliv., and proceeds, "There are only two orders of ministry—bishops or presbyters and deacons. The apostles," says Clement, "appointed the first fruits, having first proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons of those who should afterwards believe." (See *Ecclesia*, p. 67.)

"Polycarp's extant Epistle professes to be from Polycarp and the presbyters with him to the Church of God sojourning at Philippi. *In it is no mention of three orders of the ministry;* the duty is affirmed of being subject to the presbyters and deacons, as unto God and Christ, and the character and ministrations of these officers are described." (Polycarp lived, A.D. 96.)

I will add extracts from a few more of the many authorities, to convince believers in episcopacy of the folly of the claim that episcopacy was enjoined in

the Scriptures; and, as usual, I will bring the greater part of my witnesses out of the very Church some of whose members so boldly assert this claim. The first of these extracts will be from a book called, *The Churchman Armed,* and from a sermon by the Rev. James Bardsley, Rector of St. Ann's, Manchester, England. (See p. 198): "I need not, my brethren, remind you that there are persons amongst us who would exaggerate this amongst other things, and who would tell you that episcopacy is necessary to the very existence of the Church. I believe the person who says it, affirms it without any direct evidence from the Church of England."

Then on page 200, the same clergyman says: "I say, therefore, that while I hold episcopacy is of divine origin, and is essential to the *perfection* of the Church, YET THE MAN WHO SAYS THERE CANNOT BE A CHURCH WITHOUT A BISHOP, NOT ONLY HAS NOT THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND WITH HIM, BUT, I AM CONVINCED, HE CANNOT QUOTE THE NAME OF A SINGLE GREAT LUMINARY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN DEFENCE OF SUCH A THEORY.

"I go not only to the judicious Hooker, to Bishop Hall, and Archbishop Usher, where I do not find it, but I go to the highest churchmen, to Archbishop Bramhall, to Bishop Cousins, and to churchmen of the highest type, and I find they maintain no such thing. It is, of course, easy for me, in the pulpit, to make such an assertion, and therefore to shield my assertion I would say—if any of you will read the sermons delivered by the late Bishop of London (Bishop Blomfield—and no one will accuse him of Low Churchman-

ship) at the consecration of the first Bishop of Jerusalem, you will see how he quotes the names of Hall, Hooker, Usher, Bramhall, and others, like the latter, who are called high and orthodox churchmen; but all agree in saying, that while episcopacy is essential to the *well*-being, it is not essential to the *being* of the Church. This distinction, my brethren, I think most important. The word Church means, then, a number of congregations all joined together, presided over by their own pastors, and they by a chief pastor; the Church itself being called by the name of the city or region in which it was located."

We will also quote from Hallam to prove that this doctrine of episcopacy as necessary to a valid Church of Christ, was not held by the early Church of England, but was brought in subsequently by the High Church, or Romish party.

On the 522nd page of his *Constitutional History of England*, he says: "Reflecting men would perhaps be apt to say that the usage of primitive antiquity, upon which all parties laid so much stress, was rather a presumptive argument against the adoption of any system of Church government."

Again, he shows that, not only was the presbyterial form of ordination admitted by them to be true and valid, but it was common to admit such as had been thus ordained to the exercise of all the duties of the ministry in the Church of England. In a foot-note on page 281, Hallam says: "It is evident, by some passages in Strype, attentively considered, that natives regularly ordained abroad in the Presbyterian

Churches, were admitted to hold preferment in England; the first bishop who objected to them seems to have been Aylmer. Instances, however, of foreigners holding preferment without any re-ordination, may be found down to the civil wars."

Another foot-note on the same page informs us that: "Laud had been reproved by the University of Oxford, in 1604, for maintaining in his exercise for Bachelor of Divinity, that there could be no true Church without bishops," clearly showing that the University not only rejected that assumption, but strongly reprobated it. And in the same note, he says: "The divine right of episcopacy is said to have been laid down by Bancroft in his famous sermon at St. Paul's Cross in 1588, but I do not find anything in it to that effect. Cranmer and most of the original founders of the Anglican Church, so far from maintaining the divine and indispensable right of episcopal government, held *bishops and priests to be the same order.*"

In recording the efforts to force the doctrine of episcopacy upon the new Protestant Church of England, by Bancroft, Neile and Laud, Hallam says, "They began by preaching the Divine right, as it is called, or absolute indispensability of episcopacy, a doctrine of which the first traces, as I apprehend, are found about the end of Elizabeth's reign. They insisted on the necessity of episcopal succession regularly derived from the apostles." (See *Constitutional History of England,* pp. 280 and 281).

Then, on pages 524 and 525, this significant record is found, which reveals the paternity of this theory in

the Church of England, to be in the High Church party. "The malignity of those who chiefly managed Church affairs at this period, displayed itself in another innovation tending to the same end. It had been not unusual from the very beginning of our reformation, to admit ministers ordained in foreign Protestant Churches to benefices in England. No re-ordination had ever been practised with respect to those who had received the imposition of hands in a regular Church; and hence it appears that the Church of England, whatever tenets might latterly have been broached in controversy, *did not consider the ordination of presbyters invalid.* Though such ordinations as had taken place during the late troubles, and by virtue of which a great part of the actual clergy were in possession, were evidently irregular on the supposition that the English Episcopal Church was then in existence; yet, if the argument from such great convenience as men call necessity was to prevail, it was surely worth while to suffer them to pass without question for the present, enacting provisions, if such were required, for the future. But this did not fall in with the passion and policy of the bishops who found a pretext for their worldly motives of action in the *supposed Divine right,* and necessity of episcopal succession, a theory naturally more agreeable to arrogant and dogmatical ecclesiastics, than that of Cranmer, *who saw no intrinsic difference between bishops and priests;* or of Hooker, who thought ecclesiastical superiorities, like civil, subject to variation; or of Stillingfleet, who had lately pointed out the impossibility of ascertaining

beyond *doubtful conjecture* the real constitution of the Apostolic Church, from the scanty and inconclusive testimonies that either Scripture or antiquity furnish."

"It was therefore enacted in the statute for uniformity, that no person should hold any preferment in the Church of England without having received episcopal ordination." Thus presbyterial ordinations were recognized, both theoretically and practically, by the Church of England till the year A.D., 1661, when the Romish views of the High Church party obtained the ascendency over the Protestant element, and episcopacy was by parliament made the only valid form for the government of a true Church of Christ. Macaulay, speaking of the formation of the Church of England, says: "The founders of the Anglican Church took a middle course. They retained episcopacy, but they did not declare it to be an institution essential to the welfare of a Christian society, or to the efficacy of the sacraments. Cranmer, indeed, plainly avowed his conviction that, in the primitive times, there was no distinction between bishops and priests, and that the laying on of hands was altogether unnecessary." (See p. 15, *History of England,* Butler's edition.)

But while the Church of England at its organization as a new Church in 1533, did not consider episcopacy necessary to a valid Church, after holding and practising that belief for nearly 130 years, in 1661, under the influence of High Churchmen, declare that no Church is a true Church, unless it holds and practises this doctrine of episcopacy, or three distinct orders in the Christian ministry.

It must be remembered that the odium attaching to the High Church schismatics in the Church of England, should not be cast upon the Evangelical or Low Church party, many of whom look with sorrow and shame on the course pursued by their Romish brethren in the Episcopalian Church.

Another testimony against the claim that episcopacy, as held by High Churchmen, was the form of government in the early Christian Church, is found in the history of Bede. It would also lead to the conclusion that the Church government in the ancient British Church was Presbyterial.

In describing the form of Church government in Iona at that early date, he says:—

"That island has for its ruler an abbot, who is a priest, to whose direction all the province, and *even the bishops, contrary to their usual custom, are subject, according to the example of their first teacher who was not a bishop, but a priest and monk.*" (See *Bede's Ecc. His.*, book iii., chap., 4.)

There was no "episcopacy" in this ancient British Church where a *priest* was superior in power to the *bishops*, and Bede says, "*it was contrary to the usual method*," that is, contrary to that to which Bede was accustomed, viz., *the episcopacy of Rome.* Again in book iii., chap. 5, an account is given of the sending of Aidan to preach to the English people. In a company of elders it is decided to send Aidan, and Stapleton's translation, printed in 1622, reads: "*Thus making him bishop they sent him forth to preach.*" This was *presbyterial ordination, ordained by elders,* and *sent*

on his mission by *elders, and this in the ancient British Church?*

And still I will give another instance found in Bede's *Ecc. His.* In book iii., chap. 28, we are told that Ceadda, (Chad) was sent to the province of the West Saxons to be ordained bishop, where Wini was bishop. "This Wini, assisted by two bishops of the British nation, consecrated Chad a bishop." Bede also adds, "For at that time there was no other bishop in all Britain *canonically ordained besides Wini.*"

How then had these two British bishops, who assisted Wini in consecrating Chad, been ordained, if not canonically according to Rome's canons? The only answer is, *the ancient British Church was presbyterial* in its form of government, and these bishops had been ordained by *elders or presbyters in the same manner as Aidan.* Further proof is found in book iv., chap. 2, where Bede tells of the course pursued by Archbishop Theodore after Pope Vitalian sent him to England: "Theodore, visiting all parts, ordained bishops in proper places, and with their assistance corrected such things as he found faulty. Among the rest, when he upbraided Bishop Chad that he had not been *duly consecrated*, he, with great humility answered, 'If you know I have not duly received EPISCOPAL ordination, I willingly resign the office, for I never thought myself worthy of it; but, though unworthy, in obedience submitted to undertake it." He had been ORDAINED A BISHOP, but not EPISCOPALLY. How then? PRESBYTERIALLY is the only answer.

The form of Church government in these ancient assemblages of ancient British Christians was presby-

terial, that is, THEY HAD NO THIRD ORDER CALLED BISHOPS, who were ecclesiastically superior to presbyters, or, to put it in still another form, in the ancient British Church the scriptural equality of presbyters and bishops was retained, in opposition to the theory of three orders that Rome espoused. We submit that these facts, and many more which might be adduced, clearly establish the claim that the early British Church was presbyterial in its form of government, which form prevailed in apostolic times.

Many testimonies to prove that the early English Church rejected the High Church doctrine of episcopacy as necessary to a valid Church of Christ might be added, but I will submit but a few.

They will be found in that logical and exhaustive treatise on "Apostolic Succession," by the Rev. Thomas Powell. I will for the convenience of such as may desire to search the authorities quoted produce the references given by Mr. Powell.

"Wickliffe, who is called the morning star of the Reformation, says: 'I boldly assert one thing, viz., that in the Primitive Church, or in the time of St. Paul, two orders of the clergy were sufficient, that is, a priest and a deacon. In like manner, I affirm, that in the time of Paul, the presbyter and the bishop were names of the same office. This appears from the third chapter of the First Epistle to Timothy, and in the first chapter of the Epistle to Titus. And the same is testified by that profound theologian, Jerome." (See Wickliffe's "Trialogus," as quoted by Vaughan in his *Life of Wickliffe*, vol. ii., p. 275, ed. 1831, London; see p. 139 *Apostolic Succession*, Powell.)

"Bishop Burnet observes, "Another thing is, that both in this writing and in the 'Necessary Erudition of a Christian man,' bishops and priests are spoken of as one and the same office; priest by these reformers everywhere means presbyter."

The words "this writing," in the quotation will be understood by the following, "Bishop Burnet's remarks on the nature and value of these documents shall now introduce them. He says: "After some of the sheets of this history were wrought off, I met with manuscripts of great authority, out of which I have collected several particulars, that give a clear light to the proceedings in those times. I shall add them here. In this writing bishops and priests are spoken of as one and the same office. It had been the common style of that age to reckon bishops and priests as the same office."

The document to which Burnet refers, appears to be the determinations of a convocation of archbishops, bishops and divines, for Cromwell (Thomas), the King's Vicar-General, signs first as presiding over the convocation.

I will not insert the whole document, which can be found in Powell, on *Succession;* but give that which decidedly settles the question of how episcopacy, or three orders, was held by the very men who actually formed the articles, the book of orders, and the plan of the government of the Church of England. This document they call, "A Declaration made of the Functions and Divine Institution of Bishops and Priests, an original," and in it they say, "*The truth is, that in the New Testament there is no mention made of any*

degrees, or distinctions in orders, but only of deacons and ministers, and of priests or bishops."

Then follow these signatures: Thomas (Ld.) Cromwell, the King's Vicar-General; T. Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury; Edward, Archbishop of York; John, Bishop of London; and eleven other bishops, and sixteen other members of the Convocation, besides a number of names which Burnet said were illegible.

With the absence of testimony of Scripture in favor of episcopacy as necessary to a valid Christian Church, and the teaching which it sets forth undoubtedly sanctioning the presbyterial form of government; with the weight of the history of the Christian Church of the first century bearing the same testimony, add to these the strong, clear declarations of the early divines of the Church of England, and the concurrent witness of many of the best of the ministers of that Church to-day; and we may, without fear of erring, say positively that episcopacy is not necessary to a true and valid Church of Christ, but that the form of Church government is not commanded or enjoined in the Word of God, but left to the godly judgment of succeeding ages, to follow the simple, reasonable and successful plan of the Church of the apostolic age; and the first century, which, most undoubtedly was governed by the senior members, called elders or presbyters, elected to that office by the votes of the congregation, or in other words, the presbyterial form of Church government. Hence it is evident that episcopacy is not prescribed in the Scriptures, and is not necessary to a true and valid Christian Church.

CHAPTER XI.

The Wider Question—Is the High Church Doctrine of Apostolic Succession a Scriptural Truth?—Was it Instituted on the Mount in Galilee?

HAVING exposed the fallacy of the assertion that episcopacy is the divinely instituted form of Church Government, we now turn to the twin error of Apostolic Succession. We have, we believe, proven that the claim of the High Church sect to possess a line of succession from the apostles through an ancient British Church, is an absurd and preposterous claim; also that so many grave and perplexing irregularities are connected with the consecration of Parker, by whom some of them profess to have obtained their holy orders through the Roman succession, that all claims to such a line through him are equally worthless, as that through the ancient British Church. But we now come to consider the wider question involved. Is there in any Church an unbroken line of successors of the apostles down to the present day, and are there any apostles now holding the same relation to, and possessed of the same power in Christ's Church as the original band appointed by our Lord?

An apology for discussing this proposition, which is so generally conceded by Protestants to be an absurdity, is found in the persistency and boldness with

which the High Church or Anglican party affirm it, and the still more astonishing boldness with which they affirm their ability to prove their claim by what they assert is the establishment by our Lord of an apostolic band, which was to be a perpetual institution in the Church till the close of its mission; and also by what they without faltering in their tone, boldly declare are the unimpeachable records of such an unbroken line of successors of the first apostles, down even to the present time, who are apostles of our Lord as fully and perfectly as the original twelve. If questioned closely, they will gradually modify their claim, and admit that their succession is not as accurately illustrated by the word "chain," as by the wider and more elastic term "net." The latter is evidently a safer term, and it is prudent to use it, for it suits their claim more accurately, as they clearly see that when one link in a chain is broken, the continuity of the chain is at an end; but, a few or many of the meshes of a net may be severed, and yet, the trap may be successful in snaring such as do not discover the want of connection in the parts. When pressed, upon the assumption that the present bishops in the English Church are actually and really apostles, in the full sense in which the term is applied to the true scriptural apostles, they will also abate their pretensions, and admit that these modern apostles are not possessed of *quite* all the *qualifications* which were found in true apostles appointed and commissioned by our Lord. They will also confess, that they do not possess the *powers* which distinguished the apostles from the rest of the early missionaries who went out to preach the Gospel. In

fact, when their claim is sifted closely, it narrows down to a professed authority, to control the Church by virtue of a pretended succession from the apostles, irrespective of the possession of the grace and authority which the special baptism of the Holy Ghost conferred, which Christ made an imperative necessity.

We will first notice their theory as to the founding of the apostolic order in perpetuity by our Lord. This will be shown to be the result of a misconception of the import of our Lord's action, and testimony in proof of this will be brought from the best Biblical scholars in the Christian Church, including some of the most prominent among the justly revered names which add lustre to the ministry of the English Church. Next, the testimony of standard historians, ecclesiastical and secular, will be submitted in proof of the contention that their claim to an apostolic succession is in direct opposition to the testimony of the centuries through which they assert it has come to us.

To present the High Church theory that Christ founded a perpetual apostolate when on the mount He promised His disciples that His presence, in the person of the Holy Spirit, should be with His people to the end of the world, I will quote the words of the High Churchman who wrote "Methodism *vs.* The Church." On the 25th page we find this positive statement, which is also put forward with similar confidence by Bishop Randall of Colorado, in his "Why I am a Churchman," p. 12; by Bishop Doane, in his "Manual of Christian Doctrine," third series p. 119, and by many others of that same sect. The assertion

is as follows: "The apostles without successors! Where is the Master's promise? "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." This was a promise made to the *apostles* and to them *only*. Examine it carefully, "*unto the end of the world.*" Look at it again—"always,—*all* the days of the world unto its very end. *Not even for a day* shall your line be broken. When Christ said He would be *with them* to the end of the world, He was to be with them and their *successors*. We conclude, therefore, that the apostolic office is still in existence in this year of grace 1885. Call this "succession dogma" a "human invention." No, sir. God is the author of it. God is the preserver of it. It *cannot* fail any more than Christ's own promise can fail." (*Methodism* vs. *The Church*, p. 24.)

A few words will make clear the significance of that meeting between our Lord and His disciples as related in Matthew xxviii. 16 to 20. It is to be noticed that in stating who were with Christ, Matthew says, verse 16, "Then the eleven *disciples* went away into Galilee," etc. He does not speak of them as apostles possessing a power withheld from the ordinary ministry of the Church, but as those who represented the ordinary ministry by which the world was to be evangelized. This appears from the nature of the commission He gave them, and the promise of His continued presence which accompanied it. The commission was, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe

all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Now, what authority is here given? We reply, authority to "teach and baptize." Is authority to teach and baptize the distinguishing and peculiar characteristic of the apostolic office? Not at all. By whom has all the authority contained in this commission been exercised in the Christian Church during every year of its existence and down to the present day? But one answer can be given to this decisive question, and that is, that in every age of the Christian Church the power to teach and baptize has, without dispute, been exercised by presbyters. It is without any controversy clear, that on the mount Christ gave to His eleven disciples just that authority which has by universal consent ever belonged to, and been exercised by, presbyters or elders in His Church. And further, it is equally clear that it was to them in the exercise of this authority, and in the performance of this duty, that He gave the promise of His blessed presence to the end of the world.

Now, when the work performed by presbyters includes all the authority that this commission conveyed to the disciples, where are we to find in it a special authority to another order in the ministry above presbyters or elders, and who receive in these identical words, their superior authority? It is simply a contradiction to assert it. And further, it is worthy of notice that Christ's presence and power are necessary as a proof of a valid Christian ministry, and when that presence is wanting, such ministry is but a mockery, and ceases to be a part of Christ's true

Church. This in itself is fatal to the claim of apostolic succession, as history proves that many through whom the apostolic succession professedly descended, if it exists now, were men of the vilest characters and of the most profane and obscene lives. Will they assert there could be a valid succession in a Christian ministry without the presence of Christ, when He promised that His presence would be with them unto the end of the world, hence a ministry where His presence was not, would not be a true ministry; or would they on the other hand, so daringly profane the Blessed Lord, as to say that He was present with, and acknowledged as His ministers, these men in their pretended apostolic line, of whom history reveals such wickedness in their daily lives as would to-day consign one guilty of such conduct, not only infamy in public estimation, but actually to the felon's cell! Yet this latter fearful alternative, the advocates of this dogma of apostolic succession, are compelled to adopt, and to-day actually defend it. Why, we may ask? The reply is *that only through moral monstrosities have they even a pretence of a claim to a line of apostolic succession.* This will appear in the evidence from some of their own bishops, which is to follow.

Believing that the claim that Christ founded a permanent apostolic order possessed of authority superior to that of presbyters is based upon a misconception of the nature of the commission given them, I will add a quotation from but one commentator in support of the opposite view.

In Lange, the great German commentator, we find,

"They came forward here as the representatives of the entire band of disciples, and *not as the select apostolic college of the twelve, which makes its first appearance after the selection of Matthias.*"

As the representatives of the whole company of the disciples, they received the commission for the entire band which they represented, and the duties which were to be performed by the true Christian ministry in all succeeding ages, and to them thus representing the ministry of the Christian Church, was given the precious assurance that in the faithful performance of this work of teaching and baptizing, they would be cheered through all the future ages with a sense of the presence of the Blessed Master, but there is not the most remote reference to the communication to them and their successors, at this time of any greater authority than has in every age of the Church been universally accorded to presbyters. Yet such power the High Church party claim to pertain to those in their apostolic line of succession, and that Christ conferred it in this commission given His disciples on the mount. It is evident that if they had Scriptural authority for their dogma, they would not be forced to so manifestly distort the Word of God.

CHAPTER XII.

The Testimony of History, and of some of the Earlier and Latter Divines in the Church of England, regarding the Doctrines of Apostolic Succession.

IN order that a clear view of this question may be presented, I will quote from recognized High Church authorities the claims they put forth for the doctrine of apostolic succession; and then submit proofs of the falsity of their assertions.

Dr. Hook says, "This continued descent is evident to every one who chooses to investigate it. There is not a bishop, priest, or deacon, who cannot, if he please, trace his own spiritual descent from St. Peter or St. Paul." (See *Apostolic Succession*, Snodgrass, p. 214.) The Oxford divines declare, "as to the fact of the apostolic succession, that is, that our present bishops are the heirs and representatives of the apostles by successive transmission of their prerogative of being so, this is too notorious to require proof. Every link in the chain is known from St. Peter to our present metropolitans. (*Ibid.* 214.)

Another statement is so unique in its character, that it certainly is worthy a place in this succession of absurd statements. It is from a *Dictionary of the*

Church, published in New York, in 1839, and is as follows: "It is now more easily to be proved that the Archbishop of Canterbury was canonically ordained, than that any person now living *is the son of him who is called his father*; and that the same might have been said of any archbishop or bishop, that ever sat in that, or any other episcopal see, during the time of his being bishop. (*Ibid.*, see pp. 214 and 215.)

Bishop Doane's "Manual of Doctrine," on page 134, has this question and answer—

Q. Is there any danger of this line of succession (apostolic) ever having been broken?

A. No, we are SURER of it than we are THAT OUR BIBLES OF TO-DAY ARE THE TRUE SUCCESSORS OF THE FIRST BIBLE.

With the utmost assurance High Churchmen declare they have an actual register of this unbroken succession from the present back to apostolic times, apparently oblivious to the fact that the statement is not only absolutely false, but is easily proven to be without even the first probability of truth.

I will now prove by quotations which cannot be ignored, nor contradicted, the utter foolishness of these claims. In attempting to present the testimony of history, and the statements of many of the most celebrated divines of the early, and present Church of England, to disprove this theory which rests solely on audacious assertions, one must act the part of a hurried traveller passing quickly through a rich harvest field, snatching here and there a head of grain, rather than the reaper whose duty it is to garner the abun-

dant harvest. The testimony is so voluminous that only a very small part can find a place here. We will present only selections from the abundant material at hand, but enough to settle this question in the minds of all sincere enquirers, and completely overturn and disprove the arrogant and untrue claims above quoted for this theory.

As Eusebius is the fountain of ecclesiastical history, I will notice what he says in his first chapter, to show what his effort was. Eusebius says: "As it is my purpose to record the succession of the holy apostles together with the times since our Saviour down to the present," etc. The first effort was to trace the "*succession of the apostles.*" Now, when did he undertake it? Probably in the *first half of the fourth century.* What does he say about the advantages he possessed? for by them we must weigh the evidence he gives of an unbroken succession. He says, chapter 1st: "But, here, acknowledging that it *is beyond my power to present the work perfect and unexceptionable,* I freely confess I will crave indulgence, especially since, as the first of those that have entered upon this subject, we are attempting a kind of *trackless* and *unbeaten path.*" No "succession" or "line" visible to Eusebius here. He also says: "Though we are *totally unable* to find even the *bare vestiges* of those who may have travelled the way before us, unless perhaps what is only presented in the *slight intimations* which some in different ways have transmitted to us in certain *partial narrative* of the times in which they lived," etc. And again, "In the execution of this work we

shall be happy to rescue from oblivion the successions, *if not all,* at least of the most noted apostles of our Lord in those churches which even at this day are accounted the most eminent," etc.

Now in these passages this historian, who starts with the avowed purpose of tracing apostolic succession, honestly confesses the uncertainty of his record, as if to warn men against trusting it as an absolutely correct history, because of the uncertainty and sparseness of the sources of information.

Eusebius also says: "Who they were that, imitating these apostles (meaning Peter and Paul), were by them thought worthy to govern the churches which they planted, it is no easy thing to tell, excepting such as may be collected from St. Paul's own words."

Let us see what Stillingfleet says on this passage from Eusebius: "If the successors of the apostles, by the confession of Eusebius, are not certainly to be discovered, then what becomes of that unquestionable line of succession of the bishops of several churches, and the large diagrams made of the apostolic churches, with every one's name set down in his order, as if the writer had been *Clarenciux* to the apostles themselves? Are all the outcries of apostolical tradition, of personal succession, of unquestionable records, resolved at last into the Scripture itself by Him from whom all these long pedigrees are fetched? Then let succession know its place, and learn to veil bonnet to the Scriptures; and withal let men take heed of over-reaching themselves, when they would bring down so large a catalogue of single bishops, from the first and purest times of the

Church, for it will be hard for others to believe them when Eusebius professeth it is so hard to find them."

Yet notwithstanding the absolute impossibility of obtaining reliable evidence, they construct their list of bishops back to the apostles, and ask the unwary to accept it as a reliable testimony. I will give the note which Dr. Moshiem puts at the head of this list. It is this: "*The succession of the first bishops of Rome is a matter full of intricacy and obscurity.*" In other words, it is *a most unreliable conjecture.*

I shall next proceed to show that the doctrine of apostolic succession has been rejected, and held in contempt by many of the best men in the Church of England, from the beginning of the Church in the sixteenth century down to the present. Listen to the strong testimony of divines in the early Church of England on this romance of apostolic succession, in which any student of ecclesiastical history should be ashamed to confess a belief.

I will quote from the work, *A Conference of the Reformers and Divines of the Early English Church on the Doctrine of the Oxford Tractarians.* By Henry Fish, M.A.

Page 5, Bishop Hooper, "Seeing that the Church is bound unto this infallible truth, the only Word of God, *it is a false and usurped authority* that men attribute unto the clergy, and bind the Word of God and Christ's Church to the *succession of bishops.*"

Bishop Jewell, page 8: "But wherefore telleth us this long succession? Have these men their own succession in so safe a record? Who then was bishop of Rome next by succession unto Peter? Who was the

second? Who was the third? Who was the fourth? It is clear that of the first four bishops of Rome, they cannot certainly tell us who in order succeeded the other. And thus talking so much of succession, they are not well able to blaze their own succession. . . . ." But St. Paul saith, "Faith cometh not by succession, but by hearing, and hearing cometh not by legacy or inheritance from bishop to bishop, but by the Word of God. . . . . By succession, Christ saith, Desolation shall sit in the Holy Place, and anti-Christ press into the room of Christ."

Bishop Burnet, page 13: "The ransacking of records about a succession of orders, though it adds much to the lustre and beauty of the Church, yet it is not a thing incumbent upon everybody to look much into, nor indeed possible for any to be satisfied about; FOR A GREAT MANY AGES ALL THOSE INSTRUMENTS ARE LOST, so that how ordinations were made in the primitive Church *we cannot certainly know*."

Dr. John White, page 13: "The succession required to make a Church apostolic must be defined by the doctrine, and not by the place or persons; that is to say, *must be reputed the apostles' successors, which believe the apostles' doctrine, although they have not this outward succession of pastors.* And Nazianzen said, 'Succession in godliness is properly to be accounted succession. For he that holds the same doctrine is also partaker of the same succession.'

"It is no disadvantage to the Protestant Church if holding the apostles' doctrine they want external succession of place and person; because the apostolicness

of the Church is not defined by it, but wheresoever the true faith contained in the Scriptures is professed and embraced there is the whole and full nature of an apostolic Church . . . . the *succession of doctrine, is the true succession, and is not tied to that which is in place and persons.*"

John Bradford, M.A., Martyr Prebend of St. Paul's: "I would gladly have the Papists show me one place of succession mentioned in the Scriptures. You shall not find in all Scripture this essential part of succession of bishops."

Dr. Fulke, page 19: "That the Holy Ghost is given by bishops to priests in their ordering is more boldly affirmed, than it ever can be proved; for Christ only hath authority to give the Holy Ghost; and therefore to declare it cometh from Him alone among men, He breathed upon His apostles, which though the bishops do until their lungs ache, yet they cannot furnish their parties by them ordered, with gifts meet for their calling as Christ did His apostles."

Bishop Alley, p. 9: "The continual succession of bishops can prove nothing of itself. Those Churches which, although they bring forth none of the apostles, or apostolics for their author, as when succeeded long after, and are daily instituted, yet nevertheless, condescending and agreeing in one faith they are to be counted apostolic for the affinity of doctrine. If they say the Church remaineth among bishops, they are very much deceived and ignorant in the Scriptures, and it is manifestly declared in the sacred Bible that the Church consisteth not in the company of bishops."

Bishop Cooper, p. 11: "If they (the Romanists) will continue to ask where the succession is? we answer: That wheresoever since the coming of Christ, there hath been many persons upon the face of the earth that hath confessed this sincere truth and doctrine (which Protestants opposed to Papists hold), we say that they are our predecessors, and we are their successors, and with them members of the true Church. It is not always necessary that the Church of God should be notable, or flourish on the outward face of the world by continual succession of bishops."

I will here add an extract from "A Treatise on the Popes' Supremacy," by Isaac Barrow, D.D., who was a leading divine in the Church of England during the first century of its existence, he having been born in A.D. 1630.

The importance and clearness of his testimony form a sufficent reason for the length of the extract.

"The apostolic office, as such, was personal and temporary, and therefore according to its nature and design, not successive or communicable to others in perpetual descendence from them. It was, as such, in all respects extraordinary, conferred in a special manner, designed for special purposes, discharged by special aids, endowed with special privileges, as was needful for the propagation of Christianity and founding of Churches.

"To that office it was requisite that the person should have an immediate designation and commission from God; such as St. Paul so often doth insist upon for asserting his title to this office. Paul, an apostle not

from men, or by men. Not by men, saith St. Chrysostom, this is a property of the apostle.

"It was requisite that an apostle should be able to attest concerning our Lord's resurrection or ascension, either immediately, as the twelve, or by evident consequence, as St. Paul; 'thus St. Peter implied, at the choice of Matthias: Wherefore of those men which have companied with us—must one be ordained to be a witness with us of the resurrection; and, am I not (saith St. Paul,) an apostle? Have I not seen the Lord? according to that of Ananias, the God of our fathers hath chosen thee that thou shouldest know His will, and see that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of His mouth; for thou shalt bear witness unto all men of what thou has seen and heard.'

"It was needful also that an apostle should be endowed with miraculous gifts and graces, enabling him both to assure his authority and to execute his office; wherefore St. Paul calleth these the marks of an apostle, the which were wrought by him among the Corinthians in all patience (or perseveringly) in signs and wonders and mighty deeds."

And again, Dr. Barrow adds, "Now such an office, consisting of so many extraordinary privileges and miraculous powers, which were requisite for the foundation of the Church, and the diffusion of Christianity against the manifold difficulties and disadvantages which it then needs must encounter, was not designed to continue by derivation; *for it containeth in it divers things, which apparently were not communicated, and which no man without gross imposture and hypocrisy could challenge to himself.*"

"NEITHER DID THE APOSTLES PRETEND TO COMMUNICATE IT, they did indeed appoint standing pastors and teachers in each Church; they did assume fellow-laborers or assistants in the work of preaching and governance; BUT THEY DID NOT CONSTITUTE APOSTLES, EQUAL TO THEMSELVES IN AUTHORITY, PRIVILEGES OR GIFTS; for 'who knoweth not (saith St. Austin) that principate of apostleship to be preferred before any episcopacy'? And the bishops, (saith Bellarmine) have no part of the true apostolic authority." (See works of Dr. Isaac Barrow, vol. iii., pp. 53 and 54.)

Bishop Hoadly said, "As far as we can judge of this, God's providence never yet, in fact, kept up a regular uninterrupted succession of rightful bishops. It hath not pleased God in His providence to keep any proof of the least probability, or moral possibility of a regular uninterrupted succession; but there is a great appearance, and humanly speaking, a certainty of the contrary, *that succession hath often been interrupted.*" (*Apostolic Succession*, Snodgrass, p. 216.)

Stillingfleet says: "By the loss of the records of the British Churches, we cannot draw down the succession of the bishops, from the apostolic times; that of the bishops of London, by Jocelyn of Furnes, not being worth mentioning." (See *Apostolic Succession*, Snodgrass, p. 216.)

I will now give the words of the "judicious Hooker," in which he admits, though reluctantly, that the claim to an unbroken line of succession from the apostles to his time was a mere fiction, and contradictory to facts recorded by history. His words are:

"There may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop."

And he also declares that this "hath oftentimes" taken place, for he proceeds: "Where the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath, nor can have possibly a bishop to ordain; in case of such necessity, the ordinary institution of God *hath given oftentimes* and may give place. And therefore we are not simply, without exception, to urge a lineal descent of power from the apostles by continued succession of bishops in every effectual ordination." (See *Ecclesiastical Polity,* book viii., chap. 14, p. 403, ed. of A.D. 1705.)

Hooker here explicitly yields the whole question, and admits that "effectual ordinations" may be made without bishops, thus admitting the validity of presbyterial ordinations; and further declares that that which he declares is "the ordinary institution of God, hath oftentimes given place;" in other words, he admits that it has often been actually done, and that therefore apostolic succession is not a necessary institution in a valid church.

Lord Macaulay says: "That during this period (the century that followed Nero's persecution) the overseers of all the little Christian societies scattered through the Roman Empire held their spiritual authority by virtue of holy orders *derived from apostles cannot be proved by* contemporary testimony, or *by any testimony which can be regarded as decisive.*" . . . "We read of bishops of ten years old, of bishops of five years old, of many popes who were mere boys, and

who rivalled the dissoluteness of Caligula." "We are at a loss to conceive how any clergyman can feel confident that his orders have come down correctly. Whether he be really a successor of the apostles, depends on an immense number of contingencies as these . . . whether in the seventh century an impostor who had never received consecration, might not have passed himself off as a bishop on a rude tribe of Scots? Whether a lad of twelve did really, by a ceremony huddled over when he was too drunk to know what he was about, convey the episcopal character to a lad of ten." (*Macaulay's Essays*, p. 393, Appleton Edition.)

Archbishop Whately, says, "*There is not a minister in all Christendom, who is able to trace up with any approach to certainty, his spiritual pedigree.*" (*Kingdom of Christ*, p. 58.)

He also says, "Successors in the apostolic office, the apostles have none; as witnesses of the resurrection, as dispensers of miraculous gifts, as inspired oracles of Divine revelation, they have no successors." (See p. 74.)

Two things are prominently set forth here, First, the plain denial of apostolic succession. Second, the conditions which are necessary to constitute an apostle, viz.: "A witness of the resurrection, a dispenser of miraculous gifts, an inspired oracle of Divine revelation." These being given in the Scripture as necessary to constitute an apostle, it is not strange that while the Anglicans claim their bishops are apostles, yet that they dare not profane that name by attaching it to the

notorious characters who make up their so-called line of apostolic succession.

Wesley, though strongly prejudiced in its favor from his early training, said, "The doctrine of apostolic succession I know to be a fable which no man ever did or can prove."

Dr. Southey said, "Undoubtedly it is not possible to prove apostolic succession." (*Life of Wesley*, vol. ii., p. 251.)

Dr. Stoughton is equally clear and decided with Dean Alford, regarding the impossibility of the continuance of the apostolic office. (See *Primitive Ecclesia*, p. 27.)

"The apostles were persons in their official relation so completely *sui generis* (of a peculiar kind) that they could not leave behind them perfectly corresponding successors."

So the Rev. J. Radford Thompson, M.A., in his essay, entitled "The Idea of the Church Historically Developed" in *Ecclesia*, p. 62, is equally strong and decided:—

"The first officers were the supernaturally inspired apostles who were endowed with signs corresponding with their authority, and who, whatever *credulous superstition* may aver, *had no successors in office.*"

Hear Rev. Phillips Brooks, D.D., a leading Episcopalian divine: " . . . . That every minister standing in the pulpit of the Episcopal Church gets his right to preach from the fact that he has been ordained by a bishop who stands in lineal succession to the apostles, who were licensed to preach by Jesus Christ Himself.

There is no line in our Prayer Book, there is not a word in any of our formularies which declares any such theory. It has always been something that has been held by individuals, a theory that has recommended itself to certain classes and kinds of minds, AND A THEORY WHICH MANY, AND MANY MINISTERS AND LAYMEN IN THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH HAVE THOROUGHLY DISBELIEVED."

Rev. Dyson Hague, an episcopal clergyman in *Lectures on Laudism*:—

"No man who holds the doctrine . . . . of apostolic succession can in any sense be termed loyal to the Church," etc.

The present Bishop of Hereford (1844), in speaking of apostolic succession said, "To spread abroad this notion would be to make ourselves the derision of the world." (See Snodgrass, *Apos. Suc.*, pp. 214–217.) And this declaration of His Lordship the Bishop of Hereford has been fully verified. They are the derision of the world.

These testimonies, coupled with the TOTAL SILENCE OF SCRIPTURE about apostolic succession, fatally discredit it and brand it as a human invention.

In the July number of *Princeton Review* for 1885 there is an article on the "Zurich Letters," in which the doctrine of apostolic succession is held up as a theory worthy only of contempt. Read what the learned editor wrote: "The constitution of the apostolic Church was peculiar and inimitable, and was never designed to be permanent and universal. The apostolic office itself was, from its conditions and pur-

pose, temporary and personal, incapable of transmission or succession. It was essential to the apostolic commission that it should be derived directly and personally from the Lord Jesus; and as the apostles were the constituted witnesses of the fact of His resurrection—the point around which the whole body of Christian evidences, truths and doctrines revolved, the corner-stone of historical Christianity—it was essential to the character of an apostle, that he should have seen Christ, personally, after His resurrection. Now let us try those 'who say they are apostles and are not,' by these tests; let us examine the credentials of these boasted, and boasting 'successors of the apostles'—by what all acknowledge to have been the signs of an apostle. We might present those signs as summed up by Paul and fulfilled in him. Are they apostles? Have they seen Christ? Can they work miracles? Can they bear personal witness to the great fact of the resurrection? Are they inspired to declare the unrevealed will of God? No! NOT ONE THING THAT IS ALLEGED IN SCRIPTURE AS PECULIARLY A SIGN OF AN APOSTLE CAN THESE SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES DO! THE FAILURE IS NOT PARTIAL, OR EQUIVOCAL, IN ONE POINT, ON ONE TEST, BUT UNMITIGATED, UNREDEEMED, TOTAL, THROUGHOUT, UNIVERSAL, AND IGNOMINIOUS. Successors of the apostles, that have nothing particularly in common with the apostles! As well might any ordinary English constable claim to be the successor of Alfred the Great and Queen Elizabeth. We fancy we hear the ancient inspired and infallible apostles saying to these their bastard sons,

'Peter I know, and Paul I know, BUT WHO ARE YE?'"

And yet, as unsupported as this priestly theory is, as contradictory to historical records, and as absurdly ridiculous as it is, not only in the eyes of the many millions in the non-episcopal churches, but also in the estimation of hundreds of thousands in the Church of England, including many of the most scholarly and godly of her clergy, yet High Churchmen without any appearance of shame, in this enlightened age push forward this effete theory, and declare it is true. And it must be exposed, or by loud boasting some may be deluded into believing it.

Now fancy for a moment, that instead of the utter defeat and annihilation which years ago overtook this dogma, that it stands fully proven that the ministers of the episcopal body are in an unbroken succession of men ordained in direct line from the apostles. What is it worth? Nothing, and less than nothing. First, nothing. Why? Because it is anti-scriptural, inasmuch as the only apostolic succession God owns is a succession in apostolic graces, and this is not included in the doctrines they hold. It is then worth nothing. But secondly, it is worse than nothing, for if their own theory be true they must trace their parentage through a line of unusually wicked and immoral men. I will prove this by quoting the words of two of the Divines in the Church of England, Bishop Abbott, who says of this pretended line of apostles, "Amongst all the generations of men since the world was, it cannot be showed that ever there was such a succession of

rake-hells, and hell-hounds, such monsters and incarnate devils as have been among them ; heretics, apostates, dogs, most unworthy of all other to have the sun shine upon them or the earth to bear them." (*The Defence of the Reformed Catholics*, by Robert Abbott, D.D., part ii., c. vii., p. 996. From *Conference of Divines*, p. 12.)

Dr. Favour, of Halifax, England, was not favorably impressed with the value of this succession, though he bore Holy Orders in the Church of England. He says:

. . "often wicked men, sometimes children both in age and knowledge; schismatics, heretics, idolaters, incestuous, blasphemers, conjurers, sorcerers, monsters, and incarnate devils, have usurped that seat whereunto they would tie succession." (*Antiquitie Triumphing over Noveltie*, by John Favour, Doctour of the Laws, sometime Fellow of the New Collegian, Oxford, pp. 79-82 ; *Conference of Divines*, p. 22.)

These form a terrible indictment of the spiritual ancestry of the men who boast so proudly of apostolic succession, but it is from one of their own bishops, and one of their own clergymen, and fully proves that this anti-scriptural superstition is, as I have said, worse than nothing, for who would not desire to have such a terrible family pedigree blotted out, and stand as an alien to that commonwealth of ecclesiastical profligates.

A Balancing of the Claims of this Dogma of Apostolic Succession.

The Scriptures record the fact that Christ appointed a band of men to guide, and preside over the infant Church, and that He gave them special power for the performance of special duties.

High Churchmen say the bishops of the Church of England are successors of these apostles and possessed of all their authority.

Let us note the differences between the Church of England bishops and the apostles appointed by our Lord.

First. They have not the same name. The earliest bishops who knew best their relation to the apostolic office, refused to take the name of apostle, because they knew they were not apostles, and the Episcopal Church has not assumed the name. Why? It would be scouted as ridiculous. The contrast would be too apparent.

Secondly. Look at their proofs, powers and duties, and examine if they correspond to the tests of an apostle as laid down by Paul.

They have not seen Christ. They have not the power to work miracles. They cannot bear a personal witness to Christ's resurrection, and they dare not profane the truth and say they are inspired to declare the unrevealed will of God. In fact there is not one solitary test of an apostle which they can show, or, that they possess. What an absurd pretension!

Here is the deliberate testimony of two profound

scholars on this point; the Rev. Dean Alford and the late Rev. Dr. Hodge, to which I will also add the tersely expressed judgment of John Wesley in conclusion.

Dean Alford says, "The apostolic office ceased with apostolic times, and by its very nature admitted not of continuance." And the Rev. Dr. Hodge, a most profound scholar, says, "The apostolic office itself, was, from its conditions and purpose, temporary and personal, incapable of transmission, or succession." (See *Princeton Review* for 1855, p. 386.)

All these strong testimonies agree with the matured and profound declaration of Wesley, that "the doctrine of apostolic succession is a fable which no man ever did, or can prove."

We, therefore, now leave this question, after having submitted abundant proof that the doctrine of apostolic succession is a mere fancy of disordered imaginations, or worse, that it cannot be proven by the testimony of Scripture, and is absolutely contradicted by history.

The following conclusions have been reached, viz.. that neither Christ nor the apostles either commanded or instituted the episcopal form of Church government, nor established a line of successors to the apostles such as is claimed by the advocates of the dogma of apostolic succession; and it follows that to prove the right to a place in the Church of Christ other tests and proofs must be produced. To such we shall next call attention.

CHAPTER XIII.

What are the tests and proofs of a true Gospel Ministry? First. Conformity in essentials to the teachings and practices of the apostles; and Second, Our Saviour's test, "by their fruits ye shall know them." How the Episcopalian branch compares with the Methodist when thus tested?

THESE are questions of more than speculative interest to an earnest Christian, and the Head of the Church has made it possible for each to satisfy his conscience regarding them.

We will first notice that inasmuch as episcopacy is not enjoined in Scripture as necessary to the existence of a true Church of Christ, that having, or not having, the episcopal form of government, is no proof, either for, or against, the validity of a claim to be considered a true branch of Christ's Church. Christ did not make it a test or proof. And secondly, as a perpetual apostolic order, superior to presbyters, was not established in the Church, as the Scriptures clearly show; and as no such order succeeded the original band of apostles, as history with equal clearness testifies, we are satisfied that such an order does not form a necessary part of a Christian Church. So it is no proof

of validity to claim to possess it, nor against validity to reject it, as unnecessary.

We will now note two qualifications which are necessary to constitute a true Church of Christ; and which, when found in any body of Christians, do sufficiently establish the validity of its claim to a place in the great commonwealth of Christian Churches.

These are the positive tests of a Gospel ministry, the first of which is a natural inference; the second, a positive declaration of an essential truth from the lips of the Great Master, by which test all agencies will be judged: (1) *The first is conformity in essentials to the teachings and practices of the apostolic Church.* (2) *The second our Saviour's test, "By their fruits ye shall know them."*

1st. Conformity in essentials to the apostolic Church. Having shown in the foregoing pages the anti-scriptural character of High Church teaching, as exhibited in their dogmas of Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence, Auricular Confession, Priestly Absolution, etc., we hold that the want of conformity to apostolic teaching is fully established. We will therefore proceed to show that there is also a fatal antagonism between the practices of the Church of England, and those of the apostolic Church.

When tested by this axiom, the claim of the High Church party for the Episcopal Body utterly breaks down, inasmuch as in the true apostolic Church the head of the organization on earth *was not a layman*, but one set apart solely for the ministry of the Word, as is not the case in the Church of England. This is

a flagrant want of conformity to an essential condition in the apostolic Church, and in this very important matter the Church of England is directly opposed, and in contrariety to, the apostolic Church.

Again, in the apostolic Church, the power of appointing ministers to places of trust and importance was in the hands of men who were themselves engaged in the ministry of the Word; but in the Church of England this power is largely in the hands of politicians, and they exercise it often to the great scandal of good men. In fact a man might be a lineal descendant of Judas Iscariot, and as unrepentant as his infamous ancestor, and, for all there is in the law, or economy of the Church of England to prevent it, still attain a position in which he would appoint men in the ministry of the Church of England to places of great importance. Surely this is a fatal variance from apostolic usages.

Again, in the apostolic Church such a thing as the sale of "Church livings," was unknown; and it would not have been tolerated had it been possible, but as the apostle said to Simon Magus when he sought to buy a gift which would place him among them who were preaching the Gospel, so in a true apostolic Church to-day, such traffickers would be repulsed with the stern rebuke, "Thy money perish with thee." Yet the Church of England papers in England, and even the secular press, are used as advertising mediums to secure the highest possible price for the privilege of exercising the "holy office for the cure of souls" in certain parishes.

The sale of commissions in the army has been

abolished as an evil that could no longer be tolerated, and long before this traffic was abolished in the army, the public sentiment would have been outraged had a Prime Minister offered for sale positions in his Government, and he would thereby have dug his own political grave; yet strange to say this abuse stands uncorrected in the Church of England to the present day. Simon Magus, in a slightly altered form, still presents his money for a place in the apostolic band, and the English Church of to-day accepts his defiled gold and barters church preferment as a marketable commodity. It is a scandal to a professedly Christian Church, and essentially antagonistic to apostolic teaching and usage, and goes far to discredit its claims to any place in the Church universal. The huge proportions of this great evil are not generally known among Christian people, and it will be well to expose the true character of this organization which loftily assumes to be the true Church of Christ, and hurls her anathemas at others, denouncing them schismatics, and denying their right to call themselves members of the household of faith. The episcopalian body in England has about thirteen thousand livings or advowsons within her jurisdiction. For the present purpose it will be sufficient to notice that they are divided into three classes, "distinguished into *presentative*, *collative*, and *donative*. In a *presentative* advowson the patron presents a clergyman to the bishop with the petition that he be instituted into the vacant living. The bishop is bound to induct if he find the clergyman canonically qualified, and a refusal on his part is subject to an appeal to an ecclesiastical

court, either by the patron or by the presentee. In a *collative* advowson the bishop is himself the patron, either in his own right, or in the rights of the proper patron, which has lapsed to him through not being exercised within the statutory period of six months after the vacancy has occurred. In a *donative* advowson, the sovereign, or any subject by special license from the sovereign, confers a benefice by a simple letter of gift, without any reference to the bishop and without any presentation and institution." (See *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Art. *Advowson.*)

These upward of thirteen thousand livings are divided about as follows: Under the patronage of the crown, one thousand one hundred and forty-four; bishops, two thousand three hundred and twenty-four; deans and chapters, nine hundred and thirty-eight; the universities, seven hundred and seventy; the parochial clergy, nine hundred and thirty-one; and private persons, seven thousand. That is, the power to appoint ministers to more than one half of the pulpits of the Episcopal Church in England is held by private persons; and more than one half of the congregations in that Church must accept the minister who can make out to pay the patron the largest price for the privilege of farming their tithes. Fancy such an arrangement in the original apostolic Church! But if there were any safeguards as to the character of the patron; or if the bishop held a discretionary power, the evil would not be of so great magnitude. However, unfortunately for the cause of religion and morality, it is not so. The bishop is compelled to institute any clergyman who is

canonically qualified, however unfit he may be for the place, either through intemperance, or any other lapse in morals, so long as his conduct has not been so grossly immoral as to have led to his suspension or expulsion from their so-called holy orders. Then again, there are the donative advowsons, to which the lay patron can appoint his nominee *without any reference whatever to the bishop.* The ecclesiastical power is not a factor in such appointments, for the bishop is not even consulted. Further, these "livings" in the Church of England, being "property," "may be sold or mortgaged, or seized by the creditors of a bankrupt estate." In other words, in this pretended apostolic Church the "livings," where a clergyman may exercise the holy office for the cure of souls, are mortgaged, bought, sold and bartered, just as though the holy office was no more sacred than a farm, a business-stand, or a grog-shop. Judas Iscariot was the only apostle who would have sold livings, and he had the decency to hang himself after he sold his Master.

I wish it borne in mind that this evil does not exist because of a breach of a law of the Church of England, or the violation of the principles by which a Church is governed, by persons connected therewith. Transgressions occur in every community, and even happened in the little band of twelve apostles; but this wrong does not occur as a BREACH of the law of the Church, but is the CUSTOM, and has been the PRACTICE in this Church for more than two hundred years, and is in HARMONY with, and AUTHORIZED and SANCTIONED by, the LAW of the Church of England.

There are some whose whole nature and conscience revolt against the simony they are forced to commit, and they are striving to get rid of the shameful practice; but they are ONLY INDIVIDUALS, and do not represent the Church, which, in its AUTHORITATIVE AND ECCLESIASTICAL CHARACTER, PERPETUATES AND SANCTIONS THIS CRIME. The greatness of this evil has led some ministers of the Church of England to endeavor to expose its magnitude, and try to awaken the Church to its duty. Some on the other hand do not seem able to comprehend the gravity of a crime which is a shame and scandal to a Christian Church. One High Church writer says: "For a person already in the priesthood to buy a place where he may exercise his ministry is no more simony than it is burglary."

In order to test this statement, and determine whether the buying of a place to exercise his ministry, by one already in holy orders is simony, I will submit the oath taken by every clergyman before being presented to a living.

THE OATH.

"I, N.N., do swear that I have made no simonical payment, contract or promise, directly or indirectly, by myself or by any other, to my knowledge or with my consent, to any person or persons whatsoever, for or concerning the procuring and obtaining of this ecclesiastical dignity, place, preferment, office or living, [respectively and particularly naming the same whereunto he is to be admitted, instituted, collated, installed or confirmed,] nor will at any time hereafter perform

or satisfy any SUCH KIND of payment, contract or promise, made by any other person without my knowledge or consent. SO HELP ME GOD THROUGH JESUS CHRIST." (See *Simony: A Visitation Sermon.* By Rev. W. D. Willis, A.M., Prebendary of Wells, and Rector of Elsted.)

Here the clergyman distinctly swears he has not, and will not directly or indirectly pay anything for a "*place,*" yet, a High Church author says in the year 1886, "For a person already in the priesthood to BUY A PLACE where he may exercise his ministry IS NO MORE SIMONY THAN IT IS BURGLARY." (See *Methodism* vs. *The Church*, p. 58.) Read the above oath in which the minister swears against paying for a PLACE, and you must be convinced that this High Churchman did not know what constituted simony when he wrote his foolish and erroneous statement. Perhaps he meant to say, "no more simony than PERJURY?" for on the fifth page of the same book this clergyman (Willis) quotes in proof of his charges against the Church, this sentence from *Jones' Essay on the Church,* chap. iii., § and foot-note appended. "Perjury, which is now in a very growing state, may in time come to market with as much boldness as her sister SIMONY HATH DONE FOR MANY YEARS PAST." Why is perjury in a growing state? I will now proceed to answer this terrible question. Read what is on page 56 of the "Visitation Sermon," where we find this advertisement, and you will see the cause of the increase of perjury, of which this clergyman speaks: "To be sold by PRIVATE CONTRACT, the ADVOWSON of, or the NEXT PRESENTATION to,

one of the most important and valuable LIVINGS in the kingdom, which has been held by the present incumbent above thirty years. For particulars apply to Messrs. Birt & Burt, Southampton Office, Fitzroy Square; or Stephen Gerard, Esq., 13 Suffolk Street, Pall Mall East."

The above advertisement was for a private sale, but I will now give the opening words of two more advertisements which appeared in the public prints of auction sales of church livings without shame or concealment.

"The advowson of Rattlesden, about eight miles from Bury St. Edmund's, the incumbent, seventy-two years of age. Mr. W. W. Simpson has received directions to sell by auction, at the auction mart, in the course of the ensuing month (unless an acceptable offer by private contract be in the meantime made), the advowson and next presentation to the Rectory of Rattlesden situate in a pleasant part of the county of Suffolk," etc. Then follows a glowing description of the advantages this living possesses.

And another auction sale of a "living for the exercise of the holy office for the cure of souls," begins thus: "Norfolk—Advowson for sale—To be sold by auction by Mr. Peyton, at Garraway's Coffee House, 'Change Alley, Cornhill, on Tuesday, the 4th day of October next, at 12 o'clock (under such conditions of sale as shall then be declared), the advowson of the Rectory of Southery, comprising the great and small tithes of the parish," etc. Yet with these sales by public auction of these "places" in which to exercise his office for which he has to pay sums of money in proportion to

the tithes they pay the owner, and with the fact publicly known that money is paid for them, the unfortunate minister has to swear as follows: "I do swear that I have made no simonical payment, contract or promise, directly or indirectly by myself or by any other, to my knowledge, or with my consent to any person or persons whatsoever, for, or concerning the procuring and obtaining of this ecclesiastical dignity, place, preferment, office, or living, nor will at any time hereafter perform or satisfy any SUCH KIND of payment, contract, or promise made by any other without my knowledge or consent. So help me God, through Jesus Christ."

It is now clear why "perjury, which is now in a very growing state, may in time come to market with as much boldness as her sister simony hath done for many years past." And on the 20th page the author quotes the words of Lord Coke as follows: "Simony is the more odious, as it is ever accompanied with PERJURY, for the PRESENTEE is sworn to commit no simony." Here Lord Coke says, that in every such case of simony being committed, the purchasing clergyman is also guilty of perjury. Surely here is an open, shameless, and fatal violation of the principles by which the apostolic Church was governed, and which Christ enjoined. Yet this is publicly practised by the Church of England. It sadly fails to conform to the essential principles upon which the apostolic Church was based.

I will now submit some further quotations from this Visitation Sermon on Simony. The preacher enumerates several things which he says are commonly

acknowledged as true, and among them the following, ... "That property involving the appointments of parishes, and the opportunity of ministering to thousands of the souls of men, is, to a considerable extent, BOUGHT AND SOLD. Fearful denunciations are made by the Church against all trafficking in "spiritual and ecclesiastical functions and promotions," and a most awful oath is imposed upon and taken by every clerical holder of the Church's patrimony. ABOUT THESE FACTS THERE IS NO DISPUTE." (See page 1.)

Page 22. "And if we pursue the history I have commenced, and bring it down to the present hour, we find that we can scarcely look into one of the daily journals or periodical publications likely to meet the eye of a clergyman in which the announcement of benefices, allowances, presentations and avoidances for sale" (Mr. Willis evidently intended that the words "*do not*" should precede the word "exceed," as the quotation from page 24 clearly proves) "exceed any former precedent. Now these announcements teach us, I think, two things: first, they show that benefices ARE ACTUALLY SOLD; and also they develop, at least they seem to do so, the principal objects for which they are so purchased."

"What are, then, the chief inducements to purchasers proposed in these public announcements? Why, the amount of income, and the facility of its payment—the pleasant situation—the comfortable house—the convenient premises—the desirable neighborhood—the small population and the infrequent duty!" . . .

Page 24. "The question then is, how comes it to pass that such practices EXIST, and why have they INCREASED and seem to be INCREASING?"

Page 25. "In the first place, then, I believe that much ignorance prevails as to the sin of simony itself in its various shapes. I believe that *as a subject* it has been very little considered by the clergy, and that consequently when circumstances arise in which a man is likely to come into contact with it, he hurriedly enquires what *others* have done in like cases, and finding that *the temporal law has been so interpreted and can be so evaded as not necessarily* to bring buyers and sellers of ecclesiastical promotion into *legal* difficulties, he *shut his eyes* to any further consideration, and conceives he may *safely declare before God that he has made no simoniacal contract.*" This is a terrible statement to come from a clergyman of the Church of England, in view of the fact that every clergyman takes the oath given above. Bear in mind that Lord Coke says: "SIMONY is the more odious as it is ever accompanied with PERJURY, for the presentee is sworn to commit no simony."

Read again on page 57, the following advertisement in proof that this Church which boasts so loudly and impudently of her apostolic character is protecting, conniving at, and actually sanctioning "the detestable sin of simony."

No. 26. "A married clergyman, A.M., of Cambridge, of great experience, and comfortable independence, with a POWERFUL VOICE, and high testimonials, wishes to obtain a CURACY, or to PURCHASE A CURACY. Address,

prepaid, Rev. A.M., at Mr. Waughes, 5, Great James Street, London." This proves the charge of simony against this Church which insolently cries out: "We are an Apostolic Church and Methodism only a sect."

I will give but one more of these disgraceful advertisements from the same source, on page 58. This choice specimen reads thus: "To THE CLERGY,—An incumbent would resign directly, with patron's consent, to one not under forty-six, a beautiful LIVING, a perfect gem, one of the prettiest things in England, with excellent new freestone front house in good repair, facing a park at the skirts of a small market town, with every necessary of life cheap; productive garden, lawn, pleasure grounds, wall fruit, six acres of pasture adjoining, coachhouse, stabling for six horses, out-houses, no tithes or trouble as to income, duty easy, spot healthy, roads and society good; the whole worth, including surrogacy for granting marriage licenses, above £280 a year. Terms: The incoming incumbent to pay down £1,900 to indemnify present incumbent's outlay on the spot, and for his furniture fixtures, old wines worth £180, gas share producing five per cent., live stock, including three cows, horse, etc., pony carriage, piano by Stoddart, cost 65 guineas, hand organ by Flight, cost 36 guineas, emblements, (*sic*) haystack, garden implements, cast iron roller, iron gate, hurdles and all effects but books, plate, linen, and a few pictures. A SECOND LIVING, one mile off, worth £48 per year without trouble in collecting, duty single and intermediate, no weekly, may be had also at option, included in the same sum. There is a large family

pew in the chancel, handsomely fitted up and with a stove. Both livings are capable of, and likely to receive increase. Address post-paid to the Rev. LL.D., post office Shepton, Somerset. No agent wanting a fee from the outgoing party will be noticed."

This notice was published in the London *Times*. No comment is necessary.

The Rev. Dr. Willis then adds: "The advertisements given are by no means the most daring that might have been produced, always excepting No. 26, which, were it not for the purpose of showing my brethren the depths of unblushing depravity into which secular-minded clergymen may fall, I should not have suffered to pollute my pages." He proceeds:

"A process not uncommon is for a young man to purchase a Presentation, or Advowson; and to obtain a title to Holy Orders, is nominated curate by the incumbent whose living he has bought. The incumbent becomes non-resident; the curate has then 'sole care' of the parish, gets a lease of the tithes and settles himself down for life, with but little anxiety as to how long the nominal incumbent may live, except, it may be, as regards the improvement of the glebe house, though I have known the so-called curate erect a new one.

"In such a case as this, WHEN THE PURCHASER OBTAINS HOLY ORDERS BY A TITLE FROM THE VENDOR OF THE LIVING, I SHOULD THINK AN EXAMPLE OF SIMONY IS EXHIBITED AS FULL AND COMPLETE IN ALL ITS PARTS AS COULD BE SUPPLIED."

Here is proof from one of their own clergy that

what they themselves call "the detestable sin of simony," is a fearfully common practice in this organization which professes to be a true Church of Christ.

Such a purchase is sinful and shameless simony, and the Church of England is constantly guilty of that great sin.

Now, regarding the practical operation of this method of allowing lay patrons to sell livings where "one already in the priesthood may buy a place where he may exercise his ministry." Let us glance at the character of the persons who may hold this solemn and sacred trust. How great care a patron should exercise we all know; how much he actually does may be inferred from the following clippings, which took the rounds of our secular press.

The first is as follows: "Lord Lonsdale is 39 years old. He is one of the greatest rakes in England, a drunkard and a fighter, yet he controls forty-two Church livings." Comment is unnecessary.

The second is as follows: "London is laughing over Lord Lonsdale's hurried flight from New York from the fair Violet. Some say he is coming over to felicitate the new rowdy Marquis of Aylesbury on his accession to the gift of so many livings in the Established Church."

And this in a Church which calls itself "an apostolic church" and insolently denies the scriptural character of genuine Christian churches, while itself guilty of such scandalous and anti-scriptural practices. If it be tolerated as a part of the great brotherhood of churches, it should modestly take the lowest place, and sit with

bowed head and blushing face because of its sin and shame.

The third occurs in connection with an article on the late divorce case between Lord and Lady Colin Campbell, which caused one to blush for our poor humanity. It is as follows: "No one it is said figured to greater disadvantage, or showed more of soiled reputation, than did the Duke of Marlborough. The worst part of the story is that this chief of the Churchills receives a large pension from the State treasury, a drain upon the people's resources, enabling him to continue an expensive as well as licentious career. Not the least part of the scandal in the case of this dissolute duke is that he is *the patron of no fewer than thirteen livings of the Church of England.*"

Just fancy the extreme solicitude which would be manifested by one of these noblemen of scandalous lives to find a clergyman who would faithfully preach the gospel of purity, and watch with parental care over the morals of his young parishioners! What consuming grief they would feel if they found the clergyman to whom they sold the living where he might exercise his ministry, cared more for the fleece, than for the spiritual well-being of his flock! But who has any right to interfere, he has paid his money for the place, and it belongs to him, for it is like other property, and may be sold, or mortgaged by the patron. And all this in the name of our holy Christianity! Now I take no notice of the fact that these scandalous characters, Lord Lonsdale, the Marquis of Aylesbury and the Duke of Marlborough, stand in some sort of

connection with the Church of England, for Erastianism is practically adopted by that Church; but I hold that when by the law and authority of the Church such publicly immoral and licentious characters have, and exercise, the power to appoint ministers to "the holy office for the cure of souls," that such Church is guilty of an anti-scriptural practice, and should confess her sin and forsake it, before she calls herself a successor of the holy apostolic band, too holy for Judas Iscariot after his fall, and too pure to admit Simon Magus when he offered money. Well may Cardinal Newman tauntingly say of the English Church, of which he was once an honored minister: "We regard it neither with anger, nor with aversion, nor with contempt, any more than with respect or interest. It is but one aspect of the State." While these iniquities are practised with the sanction of the Church, the burning language of Cardinal Newman cannot be resented.

When Lord Lonsdale, or the Marquis of Aylesbury, or any other profligate, who has for sale "forty-two," or more or less, "church livings" where the "holy office of the cure of souls" is "exercised," sells for money one of them to "one already in the priesthood, who BUYS it that he may have a place to exercise his ministry," the "rake, drunkard and fighter" who SELLS THE LIVING FOR MONEY, the one already in the priesthood who buys it, and pays money for it, and the CHURCH THAT SANCTIONS THE "SIMONIACAL ACT" ARE ALL PARTICIPATORS IN, AND GUILTY OF THE CRIME OF SIMONY before the just and holy God. We turn to the

authoritative declarations of the Church of England about this sin, and we read, "It is a detestable sin and execrable in the sight of God," and yet it is openly practised within her pale, and connived at by her authorities. The humiliating spectacle is before us of a professedly Christian Church, with one hand holding up her law which denounces Simon Magus and his awful sin, while she scarcely attempts to conceal the other hand, which is stretched out to clutch Simon's gold. And this painful spectacle has been exhibited for many years by this Church, which has the effrontery to cry out, "The people of God, the people of God are we."

Well might Cardinal Newman, who held the so-called "holy orders" for several years in the Church of England, but left on seeing the breaks in the pretended chain of apostolic succession, and many other weaknesses in the system, say:

"We see in the English Church . . . no body politic of any kind, we see nothing more nor less than an establishment, a department of government, or a function or operation of the state, without a substance, a mere collection of officials depending on, and living in, the supreme civil power." (See *Difficulties of Anglicans*, p. 6, vol. i.)

With their scandalous traffic in "livings for the cure of souls" in our minds, we recognize the accurate and logical description of their semi-ecclesiastical, semi-political association, drawn by the hand of a master who had sounded their empty pretensions to their shallow bottom, and then abandoned them.

Cardinal Newman has painted a painfully accurate picture of the proud, but soiled, face of this pretentious organization.

With this painful exhibition of a want of conformity to the principles of the apostolic Church before us, we are forced to say that, in this essential principle, the episcopal body is not only not in harmony with the early apostolic Church, but is guilty of a flagrant and shameless violation of Christian principle that finds no parallel in any branch of the Church of Christ. Conformity in essentials to the practices of the apostolic Church, which is undeniably requisite in a true Church of Christ, is thus strikingly and unquestionably wanting in the Church of England; while we confidently affirm no such fatal contradiction between the apostolic practices and the economy of the Methodist Church can be found.

When tested by this first condition necessary to a true branch of Christ's Church, the episcopalian body is weighed in the balance and found essentially lighter than that portion of the Church universal, composed of the people "called Methodists;" and if judged by man's method, would be counted unworthy of a place in the sacred brotherhood, because of its shameless contradiction of the apostolic practices.

CHAPTER XIV.

The Second Test of a True Church of Christ. "By Their Fruits Ye Shall Know Them." A Comparison of the Claims Episcopal, with the Methodist Church.

THE claim of the Episcopalian Church to the right to be called the Church of Christ, to the entire exclusion of the great Methodist Church, will now be examined in the light of their records as instruments for accomplishing the Master's will on earth, or by the second test, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Let us glance at the history of these churches since their establishment, the one under Henry VIII., about A.D. 1534, and the other two hundred years later under John Wesley, in 1739. In 1739, Methodism had its birth, and Episcopacy had England. Now, in 1886 Methodism has outstripped Episcopalianism in numbers as well as in spiritual and moral power.

The justly celebrated statistician, the Rev. Dr. Dorchester, stated in a paper read at Baltimore, in 1884, that "Methodism is clearly entitled to rank as the largest branch of the Christian Church in the Anglo-Saxon and English speaking communities of the world."

And this has not been accomplished by adopting a

lower moral, or religious standard as a condition of membership, but on the contrary, the moral and religious character demanded, is very much higher than that of the Episcopalian Church.

Methodism has also in its period of church-life, which is briefer by two hundred years than the life of the Church of England, already outstripped her older competitor in the number of ministers of the Gospel. Dr. Dorchester in his "Problem of Religious Progress," p. 571, gives the total number of the clergy of the episcopal body throughout the world, and it is 31,200, with 195 bishops and archbishops. Then on page 574, he gives the number of the ministers in the Methodist Church throughout the world, which is 33,522; thus showing that the Methodist Church has 2,266 more ministers proclaiming the Gospel than the older Church has in her ranks. Were we to add the 79,643 local preachers of the Methodist Church, the disparity would be simply overwhelming, as it would show that, after allowing for lay readers in the Episcopal Church, Methodism employs at least 80,000 more agents in preaching the Gospel than the Church of England has in that work.

It would show, that for every one agent employed in preaching the Gospel by the Church of England throughout the world, the Methodist Church employs three and a fraction of nearly one-half. The lay readers in the Episcopal Church have not been taken into the account, and to equal them, we will drop the fraction, and then it leaves the Methodist Church Gospel agency just three times as numerous as that of

the Church of England. As a result, the moral and religious power of Methodism has been felt throughout the whole world, and it has quickened every branch of the Church to greater exertion.

Methodism exacts a far higher religious standard for membership in the Christian Church, has more numerous agencies at work for evangelizing the heathen, and exercises a far more powerful moral influence over those to whom she ministers the Word of Life. This superior moral power of Methodism is not strange, since within the last ten years, the election cry which led the larger part of the clergy of England to the polls, was "The Church and The Beer Shop." Both were thought to be in danger, and they felt and acted on the motto, "United we stand, divided we fall." And "united they stand" to-day, notwithstanding the earnest efforts of good and godly men among them. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

I beg to submit a brief statement from the statistics furnished by the Government, as it relates to this question in Ontario. In the first place, I will show how the Methodist Church has outstripped the Episcopalian Church in numbers during the forty years last preceding the census of 1881. In 1842 the Episcopalians in Ontario, numbered 107,791, and in the same year the Methodists only 82,933; that is, the Episcopalian Church had 24,858 more adherents than the Methodist Church had at that time. Forty years pass by, and the majority is transferred to the other side, for in 1881 the Methodist Church in Ontario numbers

591,503, and the Episcopalian the same year, 367,528, being a net majority in favor of the Methodist Church of 223,975, or by adding the 24,858 majority in favor of the Episcopalian Church in 1842, to the majority in favor of the Methodist Church in 1881, it gives an actual increase in the Methodist Church over the Episcopalian in these forty years, of no less than 248,833 in Ontario alone. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

I advance this in no spirit of boasting, but to show that God's blessing has been far more richly bestowed upon the efforts of the Methodist Church, than upon the labor of the Episcopalian.

It is not alone in Ontario that Methodism has borne so much more fruit, but a comparison of the census returns for the provinces comprising the Dominion, prove that from the Atlantic to the Pacific, when tested by our Lord's test, the Methodist Church proves more fully than the Episcopalian, her right to valid membership in Christ's Church universal.

The census returns for 1861 for Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, were, Episcopalians, 472,351; Methodists, 448,886; or in 1861, the Episcopalians had a majority of 23,465. But in 1881, in the whole Dominion the figures were, Methodists, 742,981; Episcopalians, 577,411, at which date the Methodists had a majority of 165,570, or a gain of Methodists over Episcopalians in twenty years of 189,035 *in the whole Dominion.*

I will secondly submit a statement from the criminal statistics of our Government officials, to show that

while the Methodist Church has exceeded the Episcopalian Church in numbers, it has at the same time exercised a far more powerful moral influence over those whom God has committed as a sacred trust to her guardianship. I will present the results reached by an examination of the reports furnished by Government officials of the prisons and gaols of the Province of Ontario, which reveal facts of a character most damaging to the claims of the Episcopal Church.

In reading the statistics, it must be borne in mind that while the adherents of the Methodist Church *inside* our gaols are in some years only one-half as numerous as the Episcopalians, *outside* the gaols in the Province of Ontario the numbers are reversed, and the Methodists have 223,975 more people under their influence, and were it not for the superior moral and religious influence of Methodism, her representatives in our prisons and gaols would naturally exceed in number those of the Episcopalians. I will put it in the form of a question. Why is it that, while the Episcopalian Church in Ontario, has not quite *two-thirds* of the number that the Methodist Church has under her pastoral care out of her much smaller number, she furnishes in some cases twice as many, and in other cases three times as many, criminals for our gaols and prisons? "*By their fruits ye shall know them.*"

I will take the statistics of the Central Prison of Ontario, as found in the report of the Inspector of Prisons for 1885. Total commitments, Church of England, 2,782; Methodist Church, 907. Why, with

only two-thirds the number of the Methodist Church, has the Church of England sent more than *three times* as many criminals to the Central Prison? Then the common gaols. The last five official reports contain a puzzle of the same kind for High Churchmen. Total commitments, as per report of 1881-1885: Episcopalians, 16,658; Methodists, 6,365. Why, with 223,975 less people than the Methodist Church has in Ontario, has the Episcopalian Church in Ontario supplied *10,393* more criminals for our gaols in these years? "By their fruits ye shall know them."

The returns of criminals for 1887, just at hand, add their testimony to that already given, for with scarcely two-thirds as many people under her pastoral care in Ontario, the Episcopalian Church has furnished 3,675 criminals for our jails; while the Methodist Church, with her much greater number, has supplied only 1,366, which is but slightly more than one-third as many as the Episcopal Church has furnished, thus showing there is no increase in their moral and religious power.

Comment upon these statistics is unnecessary, as they reveal beyond the possibility of successful contradiction that as an agency for carrying out the commission Christ gave to His *disciples* on the mount, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," the Methodist Church far excels in efficiency the Episcopalian Church.

These statistics, which cannot be successfully challenged, prove that the Methodist Church is incomparably ahead of her sister Church in the practical car-

rying out of the very work Christ committed to His Church, viz., deterring men from sin, and securing the salvation of human souls, and that the Great Head of the Church has given His seal of approbation to her work in a manner not excelled since apostolic times.

When subjected to the direct test given by our Lord, the boasting, self-styled, Apostolic Church falls far behind the Methodist Church, and her claim to be the universal Church of Christ is only a vain and arrogant assumption. Her own claim to a place in the great sisterhood of Christian churches, is seriously weakened upon examination, not being supported by conformity to apostolic principles, nor does she as fully prove her right when tested by our Lord's own formula, "By their fruits ye shall know them," as is proven for the Methodist Church by her history.

I will express the hope that after even this brief exposure of the claims advanced by High Churchmen, and the exhibition of the absurdity of arrogating to themselves ecclesiastical superiority, so offensively, and I must say, so ignorantly, by that faction in the Church, they will learn to look at their claims with an intelligent and honest desire to know the truth. If this be done they will cease to expose themselves to the contempt of the larger, and more thoroughly effective Gospel churches in Canada, viz., the Methodist and Presbyterian, by their uncharitable conduct. Their inefficiency would be still more apparent had space permitted me to include in my table of criminal statistics the proof that the numbers of criminals of the Church of England, as compared

with the number of those of the Presbyterian Church, would reveal substantially the same crushing testimony against the self-styled Apostolic Church, as an evangelical agency, as is shown by this comparison with the Methodist Church. But the Episcopalians are well aware that in the matter of criminals they leave all the other Protestant Churches in the shade, and do not fail to profit by their unenviable distinction when there is a distribution of the loaves and fishes. Years ago, when a chaplain was wanted for the Kingston Penitentiary, the right of a certain minister of the Church of England was urged upon the ground that "there were more members of his Church in the Penitentiary than of any other Protestant Church," and as his contention proved true, it was recognized, and the chaplaincy given him. To-day the same position is held by another clergyman of that Church, and this claim of greater numbers still holds good.

Nor has the light of advancing years caused men to blush at such a claim, for in 1881, when a chaplain was wanted for the prison at Penetanguishene, although there was a minister of the Presbyterian Church, and another of the Methodist Church residing at the place, and none of the English Church, one of the latter Church was imported on the plea that "there were more members of the Church of England in the prison than of all the other Protestant Churches together." This plea was not perfectly accurate, for I am informed that there were only seventy-eight English Church criminals there, while all the other Protestant Churches combined had eighty-six.

And here a pertinent question occurs. We have large majorities of criminals from the Church of England recurring year after year with the fatal and unerring precision of a repeating decimal. Now, does it not follow that these men who, with the smaller number of adherents, are powerless to prevent such large numbers of them going to the prisons, are just in the same proportion the most inadequate to minister the Gospel to them in prison? It must be so, unless the strict discipline of the prison has a beneficial effect upon both "the priest and people."

The conclusion to which these undeniable facts irresistibly forces us, is apparent without being formulated.

The Anglican Church is in the matters of the actual form of government, and of allocating her ministers to their parishes, fatally at variance with apostolic customs and teachings, which cannot be said of Methodism; and when subjected to the test laid down by our Lord, it is still far behind the Methodist Church in efficiency, notwithstanding her greater age, and the possession of immense wealth.

Tested then by these two essentials, the credentials of the Methodist Church are incomparably superior to those of the Episcopalian Church. The superior degree of conformity to apostolic principles which distinguishes the Methodist Church, will be still more apparent when we examine more fully her method of selecting and appointing men to the work of the pastoral office. Enough has appeared in connection with the partial examination we have made of the episco-

palian body to warrant us in saying that when tried by these two tests, of conformity in essentials to the practices of the Apostolic Church, and by the fruits of her ministry; in the latter she is sadly behind the Methodist Church, and in the former it may be truthfully said of her, she is "weighed in the balance and found wanting."

CHAPTER XV.

Is the Methodist Church a Valid Scriptural Church? A True Church defined. The harmony between the procedure in the Methodist Church and the Holy Scriptures.

HAVING shown the wide deviations from apostolic principles which prevail in the Anglican communion, and how sadly that Church fails to fulfil her mission as compared with the other branches of Christ's Church, against which the High Church party so bitterly fling the charge of schism, we will now consider the question, Is the Methodist Church a valid, or Scriptural Church? We will first determine what constitutes a true Christian Church; and then, secondly, examine how nearly the Methodist Church fills these conditions.

Inasmuch as the Scriptures do not enjoin the episcopal form of government as necessary to a true Church, and as Christ did not institute any permanent apostolic order, neither dogma forms a necessary part of the polity of a Christian Church.

We will, therefore, proceed with the positive features which pertain to a true Church of Christ.

The following words define a true Church. "A

congregation of believers in which the pure Gospel is preached, the sacraments duly administered, and the discipline of the Christian fellowship maintained in its purity." (See *Pope's Theology*, vol. iii., p. 270.)

I will use this definition of a true Christian Church, as it includes all that is found in the 19th Article of the Church of England, and also more than is required by that article, which is as follows: "The visible Church of Christ is a faithful congregation of men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." The agreement between these tests is so nearly perfect that no discussion about the wording is necessary. Let us try the Methodist Church by this test, which I believe all will admit to be fully in harmony with Scripture.

1st. A "congregation." None will challenge the statement that the Methodist Church has this qualification, when her numbers in all probability are greater than those of any other Protestant Communion speaking the English language.

2nd. "A congregation of believers." There will not be any controversy here, as none will deny that the Methodist people comprise a "congregation of believers."

3rd. "A congregation of believers in which the pure Gospel is preached." I anticipate no challenge on this point, as I believe it will be admitted by all interested in this question, inasmuch as the doctrines taught by John Wesley constitute the theology of the

Methodist Church, and the portions of his works which he selected as doctrinal standards for the Church, are declared by the Church to be her standards.

4th. We will also assume that it will not be denied, that in the Methodist Church the "discipline of the Christian fellowship is maintained in its purity."

We come now to the last, and, so far as this part of the controversy is concerned, the only really important question for discussion, are the sacraments duly administered in the Methodist Church?

As I proceed to demonstrate from Scripture and history combined, that the sacraments are duly administered in the Methodist Church, the attentive reader will find, I trust, satisfactory answers to all the strong assertions against the scriptural validity of Methodist ordinations, and full and irrefragible proof that the theory and practice of the Methodist Church are in harmony with the records of the methods of the primitive Church as found in the Scriptures.

I shall examine the mode of selecting offices for the Church.

1st. Such as preach the Word of Life, and administer the sacraments, called in the Scripture by both names, bishop, and presbyter, interchangeably.

2nd. Such as were set apart as helpers of those who ministered in holy things, called deacons, whose duty it is "to assist the presbyters in their several offices generally; and secondly, as their assistants to take charge of the sick and poor."

"To every service in the Christian fellowship there is a calling."

I need not call special attention to the fact that Christ called His disciples, and that His call *alone* was the source of their authority, and that afterwards He "appointed" some to go forth to do His work, for it is said, "afterwards our Lord appointed other seventy also." His call to the work, and His command to go, constituted the whole reason why they assumed the work.

A Divine call is, in the Old and New Testaments demanded, as *absolutely necessary* on the one hand; and on the other hand, the Divine call is the *only* authority absolutely necessary both in the Old and New Testaments.

Concerning this call in the new economy it was said by the apostle, "No man taketh this honor to himself but he that is called of God as was Aaron." Now there were two distinct phases of this appointment of Aaron, by God, to his special work. One was the Divine call made known to Aaron, and the other was the Divine attestation to man, that Aaron was called of God to this work. The first, viz., the *Divine call* was the *only* and *real* source of the *authority* of which Aaron was possessed. The proofs that God gave to man, that He had called Aaron to this work, did not add to his *authority* to assume it. While it was thus God's attestation to *man*, that He had called Aaron to this work, it did not *impart* grace to Aaron, that came *only* with the Divine call.

Paul places the matter very clearly before us and shows not only the necessity of a Divine call, but its true relation to the authority to assume the office to

which he was called. In Galatians i. 1: "Paul an apostle (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father)." To Paul this Divine call was the solid, and only foundation on which he rested his authority. Without it, he would not have dared to assume the apostolate; with it, he was so fully satisfied, that ever after in his ministry he referred to it as the *actual*, *real*, and *only* source of his authority.

This is sufficient to prove, 1st. That the Divine call is absolutely necessary as authority to assume the pastoral office. 2nd. That it is all that is absolutely necessary for authority to assume this office.

But we find in Acts xiii. 1-3, that the teachers and prophets in the Church at Antioch were instructed by the Holy Ghost to separate Barnabas and Saul, for this work to which they had received the Divine call by the Holy Spirit, and that "when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." Here is the Church's call and acknowledgment that these persons had given satisfactory proof that they had received the Divine call of the Holy Spirit; in other words, after the Church was satisfied that these persons were called of God, they, in an open and public manner testified to it, by "separating them for this work," and appointing or ordaining them to it. This service was not, nor did they suppose it was, the real source of their authority; it was simply the Church's testimony to their Divine call, on which Paul said he relied alone for authority.

In the Scriptures, then, we learn that the Divine call to the work of the Christian ministry was *first* given,

and was absolutely necessary, and the *only* absolutely necessary requirement.

2nd. We find that it was the custom after one professing to be called of God, had given to the Church satisfactory proof of the genuineness of his call, for the congregation of believers to publicly attest their belief that he was really called of God, for the work of ministering the Word of Life.

We now ask, what proofs did the apostolic Church demand of one who said God had called him to this work. There are no formal tests arrayed in order, by which the Church is to decide this important matter, nor yet are we left in doubt regarding it. They must have received spiritual eyesight, "for if the blind lead the blind both shall fall into the ditch." They must have been reconciled to God, for reconciliation to God is connected with, and precedes the blessed commission, "hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation."

They must, therefore, have the favor of God, or GRACE. Then again, he must have satisfied the Church that he has GIFTS, for it is declared that "the elder must be apt to teach." And lastly, he must have FRUIT of his ministry.

That the authority given by the Divine call to the work of the ministry is the only authority absolutely necessary, is put in a terse and strong manner by Luther, who says, "He who is called, he is consecrated, and may preach Him who gave the call. That is our Lord's consecration, and that is the only proper chrism."

Cranmer is equally clear and forcible on this point, he says: "In the New Testament he that is appointed

to be a bishop or a priest, needeth no consecration by the Scripture, for election, or appointing thereto is sufficient." (Quoted in *Apos. Suc.*, Ryan, p. 14.)

"Cranmer, indeed, on one important occasion plainly avowed his conviction that in the primitive times there was no distinction between bishops and priests, and that the laying on of hands was altogether superfluous." (See Aubrey's *His. of Eng.*, div. 6, p. 568.)

Such were also the views of Rev. William Perkins, of the University of Cambridge. "This rule must be remembered, that the power of the keys, that is of order and jurisdiction, is tied by God, and annexed in the New Testament, to *doctrine*. If in Turkey, or America, or elsewhere, the Gospel should be received of men by the counsel and persuasion of private persons, they shall not need to send to Europe for consecrated ministers, but they *have power to choose their own ministers from within themselves;* because *where God gives the Word, He gives the power also.*" (*The Conf. of Divines*, p. 24.)

But it is asked by some, "If the Divine call be all that is absolutely necessary, why then do the different churches that acknowledge this, add to this Divine call, the second call, or the ordination of ministers."

I will submit a few reasons which I trust will afford satisfactory answers to this question:

1st. It was a custom in the Primitive Church to do so.

2nd. It is proper after one called of God has proven to his brethren that God has so called him, that there should be an open, public and solemn declaration before the Church that he is now dedicated to the service of God in the ministry of the Church.

3rd. It is a valuable safeguard, *when properly used*, against the intrusion of *unconverted* and *ungodly men into the sacred calling*, and designed to prevent the possibility of a mere hireling first thrusting himself into the ministry without having given any proof of a Divine call, and then, as he is now "a person already in the priesthood, BUY A PLACE where he may exercise his ministry."

4th. The ordination, or appointment by the Church of one truly called of God to the work of the ministry, serves also a valuable purpose, as it is the testimony of a congregation of Christian believers who are well acquainted with the one professing to be called of God, given to other congregations of Christian believers certifying that one unknown to them, is really, and truly, a minister called of God.

For these, and many more reasons which might be adduced, the value of the Church's ordination or appointment, certifying to the true and original ordination, which came when God called the laborer to work thus in His vineyard, is made apparent, as one of the many *prudential* enactments which God appointed for the safety of His Church on earth.

We shall now examine this ordination by the Church, or the Church's approval of the candidate, as to the *manner* in which it was usually given, or in other words, what is a proper manner in which to confer ordination?

We will quote the words of Rev. Dr. Pope: "What is now called ordination took place generally by imposition of the hands of the presbytery."

Again we ask, why they laid their hands on them? And we reply from the same authority: "This ceremony was borrowed from Judaism, being the symbol and medium of appointment to office."

Again: Is any supernatural grace given in consequence of, or as the necessary result of ordination, when accompanied by the laying on of hands? Dr. Pope says: "The laying on of the hands of the apostles was never without a specific blessing . . . . But in every subsequent age the ministerial GIFT is imparted; not as a present mysterious virtue or grace, or sacramental gift, but as a pledge *in the soul* of all needful strength and guidance for every emerging duty."

Let us carefully avoid erring here, by confounding the *essence* of ordination with the non-essentials, or what may be termed the accidents of ordination. As the true and genuine Divine ordination was the CALL of God to the work, which was not accompanied with any external ceremonies; so the true and genuine human ordination is the CALL GIVEN BY THE CONGREGATION OF BELIEVERS to the worker, and the mode or manner of *signifying* this call is a non-essential, and so forms no necessary part of the call to the work.

This call of the congregation of believers is created when the congregation by vote, or otherwise, *decides* that the proofs of the Divine call have been fully established. This DECISION is *the real ordination* from the congregation of believers, the manner of signifying it is a non-essential. The early Christian Church borrowed from the Jews the practice of laying on of

hands, which was their custom in appointing to offices, and was regarded as a solemn and dignified ceremony in appointing persons to offices of dignity.

We readily admit that when the apostles, who possessed miraculous powers, laid their hands on others, that the act was accompanied with miraculous results, but none would pretend that the miraculous power went through the hands of the apostles as the electric current follows the wire, and that it would not have gone from the Holy Spirit to the person receiving it without the hands of the apostles as the connecting medium, in other words, the theory of "tactual transmission of grace," finds no proof in the fact that the apostles sometimes laid on hands when performing miracles.

That the power was *through the Spirit of God alone,* and was not confined to the laying on of hands even of the apostles, is clear from the fact that Divine power was given *without* the laying on of their hands.

In the third of Acts, it is recorded that at the healing of the lame man, "Peter fastening his eyes upon him with John, said, Look on us." And Peter said, "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk." There was no laying on of hands in this instance, but the only touch was when Peter took him by the hand to encourage his faith to *trust* the Divine power, but it was *not to communicate* that power to him.

Again in Acts 9th chap. 34th verse, Peter said to Æneas, "Jesus Christ maketh thee whole, arise and make thy bed. And he arose immediately."

Not a word here about laying on of hands. Grace was there communicated without the imposition of hands. And in the 40th and 41st verses of the same chapter it is recorded, "But Peter put them all forth, and kneeled down and prayed; and turning him to the body said, Tabitha, arise. And she opened her eyes: and when she saw Peter, *she sat up.*"

Here again the apostle performed a miraculous cure, or grace was communicated without the imposition of hands, for after she had received the grace and "opened her eyes and sat up," then it was that "he gave her his hand and lifted her up." These examples clearly show that the imposition of hands forms no essential part, and is in no sense a necessary means of conferring grace.

Hear the testimony of the Rev. Dr. Willett, a clergyman in the Church of England:

"That imposition of hands is a comely and decent ceremony to be used of the Church in ordaining ministers, we willingly grant, and our Church doth detain it; BUT WE TAKE IT NOT TO BE OF THE ESSENCE OF ORDERS, as that without it, on no occasion there could be any ordination. They determine that orders ministered without imposition of hands should not be iterated; therefore orders may be ministered without it." (*Conference of Divines*, p. 23.)

Thus it is evident, that while the laying on of hands was a ceremony which was usually adopted in the early Church, it did not form an essential part in conveying grace, power, or authority to those upon whom hands were laid.

Augustine exclaimed, "What else is the imposition of hands than a prayer over a man?" (See *Religious Encyclopædia*, Schaff and Herzog, Art. *Ordination*) Also from the same article:—

"The view of the English Reformers was NOT that the laying on of hands as such, conferred any grace."

It is apparent that, as I said above, the *decision* of the congregation of believers is the essence of the ecclesiastical or Church's ordination, and the imposition of hands is simply one part of the method of making it known, or of conferring it, and is not an essential, but may be omitted without invalidating the ordination or appointment which is made.

I trust I have established the following positions:

1st. That a Divine call to the work of the ministry is ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY before one assumes the work of a minister in the Church of Christ; and that he who thrusts himself into the ministry without such a call disregards the injunction, "No man taketh this honor unto himself."

2nd. That the call of the congregation of Christian believers has the sanction of the apostolic Church, having been practised therein, and that it is now, as it was then, a wise, prudential arrangement to guard the Church against intruders.

3rd. That the call of the congregation of Christian believers, usually signified by the imposition of hands, did not communicate grace, or give Divine authority to him who was thus ordained, his authority resting solely on the call given him immediately, or personally, by God Himself.

Having established these positions, I will now suppose a candidate presents himself for admission to the work of the ministry. How are we to decide whether he has a right to a place in the Gospel ministry? In order to arrive at the proper decision, let us know his measure of fitness for the place.

Firstly. He professes to have GRACE, by being "reconciled to God by the death of His Son," and the congregation of Christian believers with whom he has lived in Christian fellowship testify to the harmony of his profession with his life, and believe him to be a child of God.

Secondly. He has exercised his gifts as a preacher of the Word, and those to whom he has preached declare he is possessed of GIFTS, and has "exercised the office well."

Thirdly. He solemnly declares *God has called him to this work of the ministry*, and can point to his labors in reclaiming the lost, and in telling the plan of salvation so effectually that perishing souls have been led to lay hold on Christ for salvation, as FRUITS God has given him in his ministry of the Word.

And lastly, after careful and prayerful thought, he is so fully persuaded that God has called him to this work that he now desires to publicly and solemnly, with the earnest prayers of the Christian brethren, consecrate all his future life to that work to which God has called him, and to which call He has already given the seal of His Divine approval.

Upon these grounds he asks that the congregation of Christian believers now give their sanction to him

as a laborer in the Master's vineyard, and certify their belief that God has called him to this work.

We ask the question now, What more is necessary in order that he who possesses the above qualifications may fully enter upon, and assume all the prerogatives and discharge all the duties of the Christian ministry? We reply, no further QUALIFICATION is needed, but for the SAFETY of His Church, the Great Head of the Church moved upon His people to guard carefully the office of the ministry, and require that he who exercises this calling, obtain the witness of his brethren to his fitness for the work; and this testimony of his brethren is the Church's declaration of its belief that he is called of God, and has grace, gifts, and fruit of his ministry.

When a probationer, possessed of the Divine call to the work of the ministry of the Word, with all that such a call implies, is declared by a vote of a congregation of Christian believers, in which the pure Gospel is preached and the discipline of the Christian fellowship maintained in its purity, to have given satisfactory proof of the genuineness of his claim to the Divine call, and is by prayer, solemnly dedicated in the public congregation to the work of the ministry of the Word, he has then received the Church's testimony to his claim to the Divine call, and appointment to the work, and is endowed with valid, scriptural ordination, to the exercise of all the duties of the pastoral office in the Church of God.

We will next test the Methodist Church by this theory, which we hold is perfectly in harmony with, and fully based upon, the teaching of the Word of God.

CHAPTER XVI.

Is Methodist Polity in Harmony with the Scriptural Plan? An Examination of its Method of Ordaining.

WE will now examine how nearly the Methodist Church is in harmony with the tests laid down by which to judge whether it be a scriptural Church.

It is without dispute, as I have already shown, a congregation of believers in Christ in which the pure Gospel is preached, the discipline of the Christian fellowship maintained in its purity, and I shall now show that it possesses the only remaining test, viz., "the sacraments duly administered."

To those at all familiar with the methods of procedure in the Methodist Church, it will be seen at once from the foregoing statement, that her mode of selecting and ordaining ministers is in accordance with the scriptural method.

The Divine call is absolutely necessary for her ministry; proof of that Divine call and all it implies must be given and certified to by the congregation of believers before the candidate for her ministry is admitted to the exercise of the full duties of the pastoral office. Then, by a vote of Christian men, representing

the body of believers, the decision is expressed that the probationer having proven himself possessed of the Divine call, shall, and does now, receive the sanction of the body of believers, and is admitted into full fellowship with those who have passed a similar period of trial, and have proven worthy to exercise this calling. By this vote he is received into full connection with the body of Christian pastors, is authorized to exercise all the functions of the pastoral office, and is entitled to a seat among them in the courts of the Church, and to vote on all questions which come before them for deliberation. This vote of the body of Christian pastors is the actual sanction, ordination, or appointment of the candidate to the work of the pastoral office, by the body of believers in Christ whom they represent. That is, it is the ordination, or call given by the Church to the pastorate, and authority for the exercise of the full duties of the office. And by a solemn service of singing, preaching the Word, and exhortation to a faithful discharge of the duties he is now publicly assuming, the probationer is, by the prayers of the believers in Christ, solemnly dedicated to God's service in the work of the ministry. Thus the Methodist Church now appoints its presbyters.

Now examine the Methodist Church in England at the time of the death of Wesley, and down to 1836, and you will find that the above scriptural method of procedure was their method; and further that the Methodist Church did then, and always after, accept the vote of the Conference by which a probationer

was received into full connection with the Conference, and then in a solemn, public, religious service openly set apart by prayer for the work of the ministry, as a scriptural ordination to the work of the pastorate.

For proof see *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Art. *Methodism*: "All preachers on probation for the ministry after the completion of their probation were received into full connection with the Conference, this reception implying *investment with all pastoral prerogatives*."

That the first Conference after Mr. Wesley's death regarded the admission of the probationer into full connection, and the religious services connected therewith as conferring all the powers pertaining to the exercise of all the duties of the pastorate, is apparent from the words of the Plan of Pacification, adopted in 1795. One of the provisions was: "The Lord's Supper shall be administered by those *only who are authorized by the Conference*."

As the Conference would not interfere with the exercise of that prerogative by those ministers who had been ordained in the English Church, it is evident from this quotation that the Conference authorized preachers in full connection to discharge that duty.

As some of the preachers for certain reasons, sometimes declined to administer the sacrament, it was provided that in such a case he shall "Invite a neighboring preacher who is properly qualified to administer it." (See Myles' *Chronological History of Methodism*, pp. 230 and 233.)

Again the term *Preacher* is used, which shows that

one of the clergymen was not intended, and it adds, "*who is properly qualified*," clearly establishing the contention that the early Conferences regarded the admission into full connection, and the accompanying services, as full induction to the work of the pastorate. This testimony fully accords with the quotation from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and proves that the Conference regarded the preachers in full connection as properly qualified to perform all the duties of the pastorate.

Guided by that unerring Providence which directs the steps of God's children, the Methodist Conference thus pursued a scriptural method by giving its formal sanction, or the call of the believers in Christ, to him who had proven he had received the Divine call or command, "Go, work in my vineyard." In this manner the Methodist Church, before 1836, appointed its presbyters, and it was in perfect harmony with Scripture precedent.

Yet ignoring, or not being aware of the truly scriptural character of the ordinations in the Methodist Church from 1791 till 1836, High Churchmen say, "'As a matter of fact the Wesleyan body had no kind of ordination whatever up to 1836." (See *Methodism* vs. *The Church*, p. 31.)

But now we come to the question. Why did the Conference in 1836 add the ceremony of "the laying on of hands," on the heads of probationers, when they prayed over them that God would fully qualify them for their work?

We reply, because, though the hands of the ordainers cannot possibly be the channel through which the grace of the Holy Spirit flows into the heart of him who is ordained, yet as it was a common practice in the early Church, and was regarded as a dignified method of inducting into office among the Jews, and was still regarded as such, the Conference thought it wise and prudent to adopt that form of publicly setting apart for the work of the ministry those who had been accepted by a vote of the Conference.

That it was not supposed to add anything to the validity of the ordination, is perfectly clear from the fact that the Conference did not re-ordain those who had *not* been ordained by this particular form of consecration, their previous mode being deemed sufficient.

Now, I call attention to a statement of a High Church writer. He says:

"In 1836, Conference declared that" (and then he gives the following as a quotation) "the Wesleyan body had departed from Scripture, from the usages of antiquity, and from the universal practices of the churches, and that the conduct of the apostles acting under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit ought to be followed; and so, after much discussion and many ill-timed allusions to Mr. Charles Wesley's famous lines, ordination was voted back again," and tells us this quotation is from Smith's *History of Methodism,* vol. iii., p. 261-2. (See *Methodism* vs. *The Church,* p. 31.)

I will now give the true quotations on this question of ordinations from Smith's History.

(See Smith's *History of Methodism*, third edition, vol iii., pp. 325 and 326, and you will find these words, but not this High Churchman's quotation): "A debate of considerable length and great interest, in which the subject was thoroughly discussed, ensued. It was admitted that the imposition of hands was only a CIRCUMSTANCE in ministerial ordinations, *that the preachers previously separated to the work of the ministry, were undoubtedly Christian ministers in the fullest and best sense.*

"But it was contended that by omitting this circumstance, the connection departed from the practice laid down in Scripture, from the usages of antiquity, and the course universally adopted by other churches; and that Methodist ministers stood before the country at some disadvantage, and were in many cases placed on their defence. The objection raised by Charles Wesley to his brother's ordination was alluded to, as given in the well known lines:—

> "'Wesley his hands on Coke has laid,
> But who laid hands on him?'

"And it was admitted that, with those who held the doctrine of apostolic succession, in the sense of Roman Catholics and High Churchmen, this objection was invincible. But, instead of holding the doctrine in that sense, the Methodist preachers accounted it *a fable.* They held that the true apostolic succession was, that the ministry appointed the ministry; and must continue to do so to the end of the world."

The reader will notice the *essential* differences be-

tween what this High Church writer says are the words of the historian, and what the author did actually write.

That the early Methodists were not alone in the view they held, that the imposition of hands was not necessary to constitute a true and valid ordination is apparent from the opinions and practices of the Independents and Baptists, as exhibited in their manner of ordaining.

(See the *History of Dissenters,* by the Rev. Dr. Bogue, and the Rev. Dr. Bennett, vol. i., p. 377): "Some of the Independents objected to the imposition of hands as a practice which ought to have been laid aside as soon as the power of conferring extraordinary gifts had ceased."

And on page 379, in regard to the Baptists, they say: "In this denomination, too, there were some who had the strongest *aversion to the laying on of hands in ordination,* because they conceived that it savored too much of priestly pretensions to the communication of authority and extraordinary gifts. When, therefore, they were called to perform the service, they set the person apart by solemn prayer, *but without the laying on of hands.*"

These quotations show that before the early Methodists ordained without the imposition of hands, that ordination was performed in other Christian communions with the omission of this part of the form, and the ordinations were considered perfectly valid by the dissenting churches of that day. The omission of imposition of hands, then, in the early Methodist

Church, is of no significance, much less does it prove that they did not consider their method scripturally valid.

What is really meant by this action of the Conference which this High Churchman describes as "voting back" the ordinations of His ministers?

Simply this, They by vote declared that they considered the mode of procedure which had prevailed in the Conference from 1791 till 1836, equally valid with the form which they now adopt, in which the hands of the ordainers are laid on the head of the ordained. It is, in fact, an act of the Conference designed to stand as a protest against the absurd theory of "tactual transmission," or that grace flows through the hands of the ordaining bishop when he lays them on the head of the ordained.

It is the formal declaration of the Conference that the ordinations which had taken place by the action of the Conference ever since Wesley's death, were equally valid with those which they now performed by this addition to the ceremony.

I will here introduce one whose right to speak on this important matter will not be questioned, and whose utterances will satisfy such as are familiar with the keen incisive logic, the broad philosophical views, and the transparent honesty of one who has ever justly stood among the most honored and revered of the grand men God has given Methodism; I refer to the incomparable Richard Watson. Whether we view him as a preacher of the Gospel of Christ, or as a defender of the grandest of all sciences, Christian Theology, or

as a recorder of historical facts, Richard Watson stands a prince among literary men. In his "Life of Wesley" his genius shines with especial beauty, and his philosophical acumen illumines the record he gives with the light which his marvellously profound insight casts upon all it touches. His was no superficial view of events, nor a dry catalogue of facts standing in uninteresting and unmeaning isolation, having no visible relation to each other, and without any bond of sequence to bind them in one symmetrical whole, a veritable valley of dry bones; but with keen and searching sight he peered into the profound depths of the philosophical significance of acts. To the ordinary mind they were but accidents, standing solitary and silent, in the midst of events which were moulding the future of Christendom; but to Richard Watson they were the separate and responsible personalities of the great battalions of circumstances which under the Divine guidance were accomplishing with silent, but irresistible force, the will of the Supreme. Watson assigned each fact its proper place, and at his bidding, each declares its mission. To him no fact connected with the instituting of the Christian ministry was trivial. Hence we have a right to expect that upon this question he will speak neither with tremulousness, nor that hesitancy which is begotten of uncertainty. Nor are our anticipations doomed to disappointment. As he passes through this important part of the work of Wesley his tread is firm, and his tones ring out clear as a bugle call. It is scarcely necessary that it should be said here that it is not within the

limit of our purpose to submit at length the arguments by which Watson reaches his conclusions. For these the student must go to Watson's "Life of Wesley," where he will find them stated at length. We will present little more than the conclusions which resulted from his close, logical investigation.

In the Conference of 1746, the question of Church government was discussed principally in reference to the appointment of pastors for the congregations under Wesley's care. Of this Watson says, after quoting a series of questions and answers on Church government from the Minutes of that year, "Nothing, therefore, can be more clear than that Mr. Wesley laid the ground-work of his future proceedings, after much deliberation, at this early stage of his progress. He felt that a necessity had arisen, calling upon him to provide a ministry and a government for the people who had been raised up; a necessity which rested upon the obvious alternative, that they must either be furnished with pastors of their own, or be left without sufficient aid in the affairs of their souls. This led him closely to examine the whole matter; and he saw that when the authority of Scripture was alone referred to in matters of Church arrangement and regulation, it enjoined no particular form of administration as binding, but left the application of certain great and inviolable principles to the piety and prudence of those whom God might honor as the instruments of usefulness to the souls of men. Here he took his stand, and proceeded to call forth preachers and set them apart, or ordain them for the sacred office." (P. 201-203.) In a

foot-note he adds, "It has been generally supposed that Mr. Wesley did not consider his appointment of preachers without imposition of hands as an ordination to the ministry, but only as an irregular employment of laymen in the spiritual office of merely expounding the Scripture in the case of a moral necessity. *This, however, is not correct.* They were not appointed to expound or preach merely, but were solemnly set apart to the pastoral office, as the Minutes of Conference show; nor were they regarded by him as laymen, except when in common parlance they were distinguished from the clergy of the Church, in which case he would have called any dissenting minister a layman." Again, Watson refers to this subject: "It may be asked in what light Mr. Wesley's appointments to the ministry in the case of his own preachers ought to be viewed? That they were ordinations to the work and office of the ministry cannot be reasonably and scripturally doubted; and that they were so in his own intention, we have before shown from his own Minutes. It was required of them as early as 1746 to profess to be moved by the Holy Ghost, and to be called of God to preach. This professed call was to be tested by their piety, their gifts and their usefulness; all which points were investigated; and after probation, they were solemnly received by prayer, 'to labor with him in the Gospel,' and from that time were devoted wholly to their spiritual work, including the pastoral care of societies. Here was ordination, though without imposition of hands, which although an impressive ceremony, enters not, as both the Scriptures, and the

nature of the thing itself, point out, into the essence of ordination, which is a separation of men, by ministers, to the work of the ministry by solemn prayer. This was done at every Conference by Mr. Wesley; who as he had as early as 1747, given up the uninterrupted succession and the distinct order of bishops as a fable, left himself, therefore, at liberty to appoint the ministry in his own way." (P. 360.)

And again: "His appointments to the ministry every Conference necessarily conveyed all the rights of a pastor, because they conveyed the pastoral office; but still it did not follow that all the abstract rights of the ministry thus conveyed to the body of preachers should be actually used. It was not imperative upon them to exercise all their functions." (P. 361.) Again, Mr. Watson says: "That it (the administration of the sacrament) was not, in his view, 'a sin,' for want of mere imposition of hands, is clear from the facts that, in one case, he gave to one of his preachers leave to baptize and give the sacrament in particular circumstances, although he had received no other ordination than his being received into full connexion at the Conference like the rest; and allowed two others, Mr. Highfield in England, and Mr. Myles in Dublin, to assist him in giving the sacrament, to the great offence of the Church people there. That the original designation of the preachers to the ministry was considered by the Conference after his death, when they were obliged, in order to meet the spiritual demands of the people, to administer the Lord's Supper to the societies in England, as a true and full ordination to the whole

office of the Christian ministry, is clear from their authorizing the preachers to give the sacraments, when requested by the societies, without re-ordination for this purpose, although they had Mr. Wesley's Presbyterian ordination by imposition of hands among themselves and at their command if they had judged it necessary to employ it. Their whole proceeding in this respect was merely to grant permission to exercise powers which they believed to have been previously conveyed by Mr. Wesley." (Pp. 363 and 364.)

In a foot-note on page 365, Mr. Watson says: "The Conference, after Mr. Wesley's death, took therefore, the true ground, in considering the act of admission into the ministry, so as to be devoted wholly to it, and to exercise the pastoral charge, to be a true and scriptural ordination both to preach the Word and to administer the sacraments; making wholly light of the absurd pretensions of a few among the preachers, who thought they had received something more than their brethren, from the mere ceremony of the imposition of Mr. Wesley's hands, subsequent to their ordinary appointment by him when received into that body. Some of these at the first Conference after Mr. Wesley's death, stood upon this point; but Mr. Benson refuted their notion, that imposition of hands was essential to ordination. He proved from the New Testament, that this was but a circumstance; and showed that the body had always possessed a ministry scripturally, and therefore validly, ordained, although not in the most customary, or perhaps the most influential form. With Mr. Benson the Conference coincided; so that ordination without

the imposition of hands has continued to be the general practice to the present time."

These are the opinions held by the Wesleyan Conference of England, written in their official records, and embodied in their acts, before the imposition of hands was added to the mode of ordaining their ministers for the full work of the pastoral office. Yet Anglicans will assure us that until 1836, when the imposition of hands was added to the mode of ordaining, "the Methodists had no kind of ordination whatever." This can be said, however, of their contradiction of the facts of Methodist history, that they treat all history, whether sacred, ecclesiastical, or secular, in an equally cavalier manner, when they deem the perversion or denial of the record necessary to their purpose. If this adds to their shame, it at the same time testifies to their impartiality in meting out insults to all histories with equal measure, regardless of the writer's authority or the accuracy of his record.

But the Anglicans object because of a slight addition to our form of ordaining our ministers in 1836.

Allow me again to call attention to a similar action by the Church of England, only far greater in degree.

The form of consecrating their bishops, which was adopted in the first years of the Church's existence, in the reign of Edward VI., simply said: "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up," etc.

They were taunted with the fact that the ordinal did not consecrate the person to *any* office, much less to the bishopric, and after consecrating all their bishops for over one hundred years with this ordinal,

they in convocation added the words here italicised, "Receive the Holy Ghost *for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands: in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,* and remember that thou stir up," etc. Yet this addition, which actually contains *all the words appointing to the office of the bishop,* Bishop Coxe defends, by saying: "The words added in our ordinals in 1662 make the old form more explicit, not a whit more sufficient." The reader will see they are *all the* words in the ordinal, that in *any* sense point to the office to which the person was appointed, and are in fact the *pith* and *heart* of the whole ceremony.

But the High Churchman may say, "though we added only important words to our ordinal in 1662, words which designate the office to which the one consecrated is appointed, and the work he was to perform, which was not done in our ordinal for consecration for 103 years, have you not done the same in adding the imposition of hands in your ordination ceremony?" I reply, there are essential differences. High Churchmen claim that in their ceremony of consecration, the Divine gift of the Holy Spirit is actually given, and that without this ceremony the gift of apostolic grace could not be imparted, nor received; while we assign the gift of the Holy Spirit *to a Divine act only,* and hold the ordination ceremony to be the human, or Church's acknowledgment, of the possession of the gift already bestowed. We might omit all our ceremony, without leaving the one who had been called

of God to the work of the ministry devoid of any absolutely necessary, or Divine qualification; not so, however, with such as hold apostolic succession, inasmuch as they teach that only by the ceremony of consecration, the essence of the authority and grace necessary to constitute a right to the exercise of the duty assumed, is communicated. If, therefore, there be any essential lack in the ceremony, the grace is not bestowed. And we hold that the omission of the designation, not only of the office, but also of the work to be performed was necessarily a fatal omission.

Again, the change made in our manner of ordaining when the imposition of hands was added, was simply an addition to that which was confessedly the external human form of signifying that *the internal, spiritual grace was already possessed* by the one ordained; but the words added to the ordinal by which the Episcopalian Church consecrate their bishops, convey, according to their theory, *the authority and power for the performance of the duties of the office of a bishop*, and they are the only words in the ordinal which do in any sense profess to convey any such authority.

If, therefore, the ordinal is the medium for the transmission of such spiritual power and grace, an ordinal which does not in any sense refer to such power, cannot convey it. Therefore, on their own theory, the ordinal used by the Church of England from 1559 till 1662, *i.e.*, for 103 years, did not convey any episcopal powers, for these words which denote the office to which the one ordained was consecrated, are not in the old ordinal, nor are there any equivalent

words there. Seeing this, they, after having consecrated all their bishops for 103 years by the old and fatally defective ordinal, in 1662, added these words: "*For the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" Yet they challenge the action of the Methodist Church, because, in 1836, it simply added the imposition of hands to their form of ordaining. They strain at a Methodist gnat, while they swallow an Episcopalian camel.

When the Conference in 1836 added the form of laying on of hands to their manner of appointing men to the work of the ministry, they did not suppose the simple form they added, which cannot compare in significance with the words added to the English Church ordinal, made their old form of ordination either "more explicit, or a whit more sufficient," but it was sanctioned by scriptural precedent, and therefore right. Furthermore if the action of the Wesleyan Conference in 1836, in adding the laying on of hands, could have been in any way construed to imply a doubt of the validity of their previous method of inducting into the ministry, their formal vote passed at the same time, declaring their judgment that all previous ordinations were equally valid with those now made, *absolutely precludes* the possibility of putting such an interpretation on their act.

But this cannot be said of the action of the English Church in 1662, and for this very plain and convincing reason.

Their ordinal, by which they had consecrated their bishops for 103 years, did not consecrate to any office in the Christian Church; whereas the words they added in 1662 did both "explicitly and sufficiently" designate the office, which the ordinal they had used for 103 years did not mention, nor even remotely refer to, and it was therefore, in point of fact, a new ordinal. In view of this historical and undeniable fact, perhaps, it will occur to the mind of the reader that, while the English Church in 1662 openly confessed the vital omission in the ordinal she had used in consecrating her bishops for 103 years, by adding the *only words* which declare he is to be a bishop; that the Wesleyan Conference, when it added a confessedly non-essential form to her manner of ordaining, carefully guarded against any such charge as lies at the door of the English Church, by formally declaring that the ordination, or appointment of all such as had been received into full connection previously, without the laying on of hands, was equally valid with those upon whom hands were laid by the new form of ordaining.

It follows, therefore, that the Methodists had ordinations in a scriptural manner before 1836, that the ordinations of the Methodist ministers are scripturally valid, and that by them the sacraments are duly administered.

I submit then this brief, but, I trust clear, and scriptural demonstration of the validity of the ordinations in the Methodist Church, without deeming it necessary to refer further to the undoubtedly Divine

authority possessed by John Wesley, to lay the foundation of a system of which he said, "it was likely to stand as long as the sun and moon endure."

But there was another kind of officer in the early Christian Church, whose duty it was to assist the presbyters in their duties, and look after the temporal interests of the Church.

They were called deacons.

For the discharge of the duties of deacons, the Methodist Church appoints officers, giving them the name of stewards, and the following is the law regarding their appointment:

In Acts, chap. vi., verse 3, it is said deacons must be "men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom." In the early Christian Church they were selected by the congregation of believers, and appointed by those who were engaged in the ministry of the Word, and the Methodist economy harmonizes perfectly with this scriptural method. The requirements demanded in the Scriptures for the office of deacon are reproduced in the Methodist Discipline as the necessary qualifications for the office of a steward, for it says, "Let the stewards be men of solid piety, and of good natural and acquired abilities to transact the temporal business" (see par. 206).

Thus, in the selection of presbyters and deacons, the theory and practice of the Methodist Church is thoroughly in harmony with the Word of God.

I trust I may fairly claim that I have shown that the Methodist Church is a "congregation of believers in which the pure Gospel is preached, the sacraments

duly administered, and the discipline of the Christian fellowship maintained in its purity." And it is thus apparent that the Methodist Church is a true and valid branch of the Church of Christ, and that her ministry has the Divine sanction, or ordination, together with the true, and valid Church, or human ordination as well.

We will now present a brief review of the case. John Wesley, who was called of God, and had obtained the human sanction, or testimony to that call, devoted his life to the salvation of his fellows.

God, who called him, gave him success in gathering many souls into Christ's fold.

Believing in the value and necessity of the "communion of saints," Wesley intended, and endeavored most strenuously, to unite them to the English Church; so desirous in fact was he to accomplish this end that he repeatedly urged his followers to partake at the communion table of the English Church, and set them the example by doing so himself.

He also publicly and frequently declared his adherence to that communion, and never *formally* separated from it. But all his efforts to maintain Christian communion between the people whom God gave him in the Gospel, and the Church of England were fruitless. He was denied admission to the Episcopalian churches, and his followers rudely and insultingly repulsed from the sacrament of our Lord's Supper in those churches.

He, a properly authorized minister of the Gospel, because authorized and qualified by God, and sanctioned

by the representatives of the congregation of believers in Christ, organized his followers into congregations, built places of worship for them, selected and appointed men called of God to preach the pure Gospel to them, administered the discipline of Christian fellowship among them; and finally, at the urgent and repeated requests of these congregations of believers in Christ, by ordaining, or appointing certain of these preachers, who had given satisfactory proof that God had called them to this work, he provided for the administration of the sacraments among them, by persons properly qualified to do so.

Yielding partly to the impressions of his early teaching, influenced also by the prejudices of some of the the members of the societies, and prompted by a desire for peace, he restricted the number of them actually permitted to exercise all the duties of the pastorate within narrow limits, and hindered, as much as in his power, all manifestations which would cause antagonism between the Church which he organized and the National Church of England. Yet he took this course without admitting that he had not the power to authorize them to perform all the duties of the pastoral office; it was simply holding the exercise of such power in abeyance.

But at the same time, to protect the Methodists from destruction at the hands of their bitter, unscrupulous and unreasoning enemies in the Episcopalian Church, he obtained licenses for his preachers under a law passed to protect those who "dissented from the Church of England," and also, by an Act of Parliament enacted specially for that purpose, secured the

legal recognition of the rights of his societies to prosecute their church work.

That he meant to secure these rights to them forever is clear, for he said of the Deed of Settlement, as this Act of Parliament is called, that the rights of the Methodists were now secured on "a foundation likely to last as long as the sun and moon endure."

Thus the Methodists at the time of Wesley's death, were, by his long-considered and carefully deliberated plans, organized as "a congregation of believers in Christ, in which the pure Gospel is preached, the sacraments duly administered, and the discipline of Christian fellowship maintained in its purity," and this organization is recognized, and its rights guaranteed to them by a statute of the Parliament of the realm.

With this organization at harmony both with the method of establishing Christ's kingdom as taught in the Scriptures, and with the law of the land, the Methodist Church stood before the world at the time when her great earthly leader was taken on high.

History also tells us how the Church after Wesley's death steadily pursued the conservative polity of her leader, and only after it became most clearly necessary was any change or development of her policy allowed. Nor was there, on the other hand, any abatement of "one jot or tittle" of the rights, privileges or functions secured her by the wise, and most undoubtedly divinely-guided foresight of Wesley. As he for forty years held in abeyance, for the sake of peace, the right to ordain ministers by a ceremony such as was usually adopted for the work of the pastorate,

without in any sense admitting he did not actually possess it, so the Methodist Church for another forty years after his death, for the sake of peace, refrained from the use of that same form in ordaining her ministers, viz., the imposition of hands, without in any sense admitting that she, as a Church of Christ, did not actually possess the right to adopt such form if it were deemed best to do so. And again, she followed his example when, in 1836, believing that the imposition of hands in ordination would add impressiveness to the ceremony, and as it was authorized by Scriptural example, she adopted it for the good of the Church, while at the same time she wisely and prudently guarded against even an apparent sanction of the assumption that it added "one whit to the sufficiency" of the ceremony, by formally declaring the ordinations which had been made during the preceding years, without the imposition of hands, but by a vote of the representatives of the Church, equally valid with those now made with the addition of this form.

It is unnecessary to give even a brief review of the progress of the Church thus providentially brought into the great sisterhood of Christian Churches, and by an equally manifest Divine guidance, blessed not only with marvellous success in bringing souls to Christ herself, but also in arousing the stagnant Christian life of the eighteenth century into evangelical activity, as these seals to the true and genuine character of her claim as a Church of Christ, are gladly and cheerfully accorded her by all evangelical Christians, who also give her a cordial greeting as "the

friend of all, and the enemy of none." She has her foes, however, and will gladly, courageously and successfully, by continued Divine help, give them battle, till the millennial glory of her King illumines all dark places, destroys all forms of sin and error, and unites in one family of God, all His poor erring children, who too often forget the true work of the King's battalions in the Church militant, and expend on other regiments the force which should be thrown against the enemy, and even deny their brethren-in-arms any place in the King's army, simply because their manner of enlistment differs from their own.

And this is all the more strange in the face of the undeniable fact that the King has called them into His service, the Holy Spirit has instructed them in the methods of work, and given them unparalleled success in invading the territory of the common foe, and that multiplied thousands of her soldiers have died on the battlefield of life, ever with their faces to the foe, rejoicing that it is their privilege to spend their strength for Christ, and glad to lay down their lives in His cause, and witness with their dying breath as their leader did, "The best of all is, God is with us."

With such a record, I submit that the Methodist Church has fully verified her claim to a place on the great Christian battlefield, and has full and satisfactory credentials from the King of kings, that she is a true, loyal and validly enlisted regiment in God's Church militant.

I pray that the time may soon come when strife

shall cease, and "the watchmen on Zion's walls shall see eye to eye," and instead of greeting each other with the charge of illegal birth, extend a brother's hand, and a brother's welcome to all who, being born of God, are brethren in Christ, and of the family of heaven.

Thus irresistibly working for our common Master, we shall hasten the time when the grand millennial song shall be sung from the rivers to the end of the earth, "The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ."

FINIS.

INDEX.

A.

Apostolic Succession through Parker, (*see* Church of England)—What the other Churches which believe in Apostolic Succession say about the claims of the Episcopal Church, 103. Romish Church, 103. The Greek Church, 104. The opinion of Hooker, 105. Harmony between Neal's account of Parker's consecration and Hooker's theory, 106. Bishop Randall's admission, 108. Rev. Dr. Ives, 108. Dr. Lee, 109.

Apostolic Succession, an Unscriptural Doctrine, 183. The High Church theory stated, 185. Not instituted in Matt. xxviii: 16-20, and reasons given, 186. Lange, 188. Dr. Hook's bold assertion, 190. Dictionary of the Church, 191. Other authorities, 191. Eusebius' doubts and difficulties, 192. Stillingfleet's opinion, 193. Bishop Hooper's, 194. Bishop Jewell's, 194. Bishop Burnet's, 195. Dr. John White's, 195. John Bradford's, M.A., Dr. Fulke's, Bishop Alley's, 196. Bishop Cooper's, Dr. Isaac Barrow's, 197. Bishop Hoadly's, 199. Records of British Churches lost, says Stillingfleet, 199. The Judicious Hooker's admission, 200. Lord Macaulay's statement, 200. Archbishop Whately's, 201. Wesley's, Dr. Southey's, Dr. Stoughton's, Rev. J. Radford Thompson's, and Rev. Dr. Phillips Brooks', 202. Rev. Dyson Hague's, Bishop of Hereford's, "Princeton Review for 1855," 203 Theory useless if historically proven, 205. Proofs from history, 206. Claims of this theory balanced, 207.

Ancient British Church, 59, 62, 63, 66, 67, 68.

Aidan's Consecration Presbyterial, 178.

Archbishop Theodore subdued all to Rome, 69. Archbishop Parker's consecration, 84; fatal flaw in it, 85. Strype's account, 86. Parker's scruples, 88. Compelled by the Queen, 89. His sorrow, 90. The illegal ordinal, 91. The ceremony, 92. Validity still doubtful, 93. Act of Parliament to legalize, 93. Romanist objections, 93. The ordinal used, 94 The ordinal improved, 95. Defended by Bishop Coxe, 93. His defence examined, 97. The real question which was settled by Act of Parliament, 98. The real origin of this theory, 99. A summing up, 101.

Augustine's advent to Britain, 55.

Auricular Confession, and class meetings contrasted, 39.

B.

Baptismal Regeneration defined, 41. Wesley's teaching regarding it, 42. Cardinal Newman, 44. Wesley's view, 45. Extract from pamphlet of Rev. James Lawson, 45.

Baptismal Regeneration taught by High Churchmen, 132.

Bede describes the Church government of the ancient British Church as presbyterial, 178, 179.

Bishop of Liverpool on separation, 20.

C.

Church of England when first founded a Papal Church and remained Papal till the Reformation—Papal founded, when (*see* Origin of Church of England). It remained Papal till the Reformation in the Sixteenth Century, 74. Differences between the Papal and Protestant Churches in England, 74. Hallam, 75. Neal, 77. Hallam, 78. Hamilton, 80. Macaulay, 80. Thompson and Macfarlane, 81. Mastin *vs.* Escott, 82. Neal, 83. Has the Church of England a valid autonomy on their theory of Episcopacy and Apostolic Succession, 84. Irregularities in Parker's consecration, 85. Parker's doubts, 88. Neal's description of Parker's consecration, 91. Objections of Romanists, 93. Invalid ordinal, 95. Apology for it by Bishop Coxe, 95. Weakness of defence, 96. The true origin of the Church of England, 99. The only claim for Apostolic Succession, 101.

Confession taught by High Church, 136.

Celibacy taught by High Church, 147 and 154.

Church, The, gives the Scriptures according to High Church teaching, 133. Clergymen, one hundred, left the Episcopal Church in ten years, Why? 108.

Chad's Consecration, 179.

Conversion of Wesley, 48.

Consecration of Austin or Augustine, 67.

D.

Deed of Settlement, object of, 29.

Dissenters are heretics, 144.

E.

Episcopacy. Is it enjoined in Scripture? High Church claims, 158. Dean Alford on "Presbuterous," 159. Clemens Romanus, 161. Stillingfleet, 161. Ordination of Barnabas and Saul, 162. Wesley examined, 163. Dean Alford, 164. Lange, 164. Poole, Burkitt and Jamieson, Faussett and Brown, 165. The Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells, 166. Firmillian, 167. Moshiem, 168. Wesley, 168. Bishop Lightfoot, 169. Bishop Lightfoot examined, 170. Didache, 170. Dr. Schaff, 171. Primitive Ecclesia, 171. "The Churchman Armed," 173. Hallam, 174. When first taught in English Church, 174. Presbyterial ordinations recognized till A.D. 1661, 177. Cranmer's opinion, 177. Bede's testimony about ancient British Church form of government, 178. Wickliffe's, 180. Bishop Burnet's 181. An important document, 181. Episcopacy is not enjoined in Scripture, 182.

G.

Green, Rev. John Richard, on ancient British Church, 63.

Greek Church denies the validity of the Orders of the Church of England, 104.

H.

High Church. Was John Wesley a High Churchman? 36. High Churchmen claim him, 39. High Church teaching on Baptismal Regeneration, 41. Wesley's, 42. Cardinal Newman, 44. Rev. James Lawson, 45. Letter of Lord North, 48. Miss Wedgewood's declaration, 48. Wesley's opinion of High Churchmen, 49. Wesley not a High Churchman, 50-53. Is High Churchism Romanism? 129. Quotations from High Church "Manual of Doctrine," 131. Baptismal Regeneration, 133 The Scriptures founded on "the Church," 131. Apostolic Succession more certain than the identity of the Word of God, 135. Confession to a priest and absolution, 137. Real Presence, 137. From Gace's Catechism, 144. Testimony of Cardinal Newman, 145. Quotations from "John Wesley in Company with High Churchmen," 146. Cardinal Manning, 148. Rev. Dr. Fraser, Bishop of Manchester, 150. From "The Churchman Armed," 151. On celibacy, 154. Effects of High Church teaching, 155. High Church a hybrid, 120.

Hooker's admission of the validity of non-Episcopal ordinations, 105. High Church claims for Apostolic Succession denied by every other branch of the Christian Church, 104.

I.

Inconsistency charged against Wesley, 31.

Imposition of hands added in 1836 by the Wesleyan Conference, 253.

Ives, Rev. Dr., Bishop in North Carolina, reasons for leaving the Anglican Church, 108.

K.

Knight, Charles, on the ancient British Church, 62.

M.

Methodism, was it separate from the Episcopal Church? 25. Wesley's frequent declaration, 25. Wesley's own statement of the case, 26. The meaning of the Deed of Settlement, 28. Facts to prove separation, 30. Is the Methodist Church a valid Christian Church? 238. Definition of a true Church, 239. Are the sacraments duly administered in the Methodist Church? 240. A call necessary, 241. Proof of call demanded, 243. Scriptural texts, 243. Cranmer and Luther, 243. Perkins, 244. Why the human ordination? 244 What is the proper manner for this service? 245. Not confound essence with non-essentials, 246. Laying on of Apostles' hands, 247. Rev. Dr. Willett, 248. Augustine, 249. Positions established, 249. Grace, gifts and fruits of ministry, 250. Test the Methodist theory and practice, 251. Method of ordaining, 252. How it was viewed, 253. "Ency. Brit.," 254. Plan of pacification proves it, 254. "Preacher" the term used, 255 Why lay on hands in 1836—Quotation from Smith's History of Methodism, 257. From History of Dissenters, 258. Richard Watson's view. Wesley has his preachers assist him in administering the sacrament, 263. Anglicans object to our addition in 1836; examine their own, 265. The Conference defined its position, 268. Deacons appointed, 270. The case reviewed, 271. The conclusion, 274.

Membership in the national Church of England, 32.

O.

Origin of the Church of England, 54. Different theories, 55, 56. The real question, 56. What history teaches, 58. 59. The lease given the Ecclesia Anglicana in the time of Alfred, 61. Testimony of historians, Aubrey 62. Knight, 62. Green, 63. Canon Venables, 63. Form of papal oath, 65. Papal Church in 596-7, 66. Moshiem, consecration of Augustine, 67. Moshiem, Bede, Ryan, 67. Dr. Henry, 68. "Ency. Brit.,"

69. Venables, 70. Canon Perry, 70. The Venerable Bede, 71. Church of England remained Papal, (*see* English Church). Date of the birth of the present Church of England, 112. Hallam's testimony, 113. A child of Providence, 114. "Salt in Discourse," 117. Why High Churchmen deny that the Church of England is Protestant, 117. Is the Church of England a Protestant Church? 119. First use of term in this connection, 120. Oath in Act of Supremacy, 121. Dr. Croly's testimony, 122. Act of Settlement, 123. Alpheus Todd's evidence, 124. Summing up proofs, 126.

ORDINATION of Paul and Barnabas, 162. Ordinations of preachers by John Wesley, 30. English Church ordinal for consecrating bishops perfected after having been used for 103 years, 94. Ordinations in ancient British Church, presbyterial, 179. Parker's consecration, 86. Act to legalize, 93. Passing the Act proves the existence of grave doubts 94. Ordination by Wesley after his sermon on the Ministerial Office preached in 1789, 23. Ordained men for the work in England, 22.

ORDERS, validity of, in Church of England on the Apostolic Succession theory denied by all Churches, 104. Doubted by some High Churchmen, 105.

ORDINATION of Bishop Chad denied by Archbishop Theodore because not episcopal, 179.

ORDINAL used in consecrating Archbishop Parker, 94. Ordinal improved, 95. Improvement defended by Bishop Coxe, 95.

ORDINATION of St. Paul, 162.

P.

PAPAL CHURCH founded in England in A.D., 596-7, 66.

PROTESTANTISM the faith of the true Church of England, 121. Presbyterial ordination the method in the ancient British Church, 178. Prayers for the dead taught by High Church, 148.

PRESBYTERIAL government in ancient British Church, 178.

PRESBYTERIAL ordinations acknowledged in Church of England, 177.

R.

REAL PRESENCE of body of Christ taught by High Church, 138.

ROMAN CHURCH rejects the claim of the Church of England to Apostolic Succession, 103.

S.

Sacramental grace taught by High Church, 148.

Sacraments not provided for in Deed of Settlement. Why? 29.

Separation from Church of England, nature of the question, 12. Two aspects of it, 13. Wesley unable to answer arguments for, 14. The real question, 15. What Wesley meant, his actual course, 16. Tyerman's view, 16. Opinion of Lord Mansfield and Charles Wesley, 17. Southey's view, 18. Miss Wedgewood's, 19. Dr. Ryle's, (Bishop of Liverpool), 20. Wesley's attitude on separation amid difficulties, 16. What constitutes separation, 23. Wesley's letter on separation, 26. Its meaning, 27. His real attitude, 28. Proven by historical facts, 30.

Services by Methodists during Church hours, 21.

Sermon on ministerial office, 22.

T.

Tests of a True Gospel Ministry, 209. High Church teachings anti-scriptural, 210. Appointing of ministers in Church of England anti-scriptural, 211. Simon Magus' descendants, 211. Sale of preferments in army abolished, but retained in Church, 213. The law of the Church of England about livings, 213. The oath taken by the clergy, 215. Perjury as well as simony in the traffic in Church livings, 216. Advertisements for sale and purchase of Church livings, 216. Lord Coke on simony and perjury, 218. A terrible exposure of these practices by Rev. Downes Willis, Rector of Elsted, 220. Practical results of the system, by Lord Lonsdale and others, 223. Cardidal Newman's severe strictures justified, 226. "By their fruits ye shall know them," 228. Statistics, 229. Religious standard, 230. Criminal statistics, 232. Episcopal claims to chaplaincies in prisons, 235. Is the Methodist Church a true Gospel Church? (*see* Methodism).

W.

Wesley, John, did he separate from the Church of England, 11. His real attitude, 12. Accused of inconsistencies, 13. Two aspects of the question, 13. Wesley's confession, 14. His attitude analyzed, 16, 17. Lord Mansfield's opinion, 17. Tyerman's, 18. Dr. Southey's, 18, 19. Miss Wedgewood's, 19. The Bishop of Liverpool, Dr. Ryle, 20. Wesley's acts as understood by others, 21, 22. What constitutes separation, 23.

Wesley and the High Church, 36. Wesley on Apostolic Succession, on Episcopacy, 168; On Baptismal Regeneration, 42, 44. Wesley ordained ministers for the Methodist societies, 21, 22, 23.

211472

Relig.
Theol.
Doct.
W.

Author Williams, Thomas Grange

Title Methodism and Anglicanism.

DATE. NAME OF BORROWER.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU